INDEX

STATEMENT AS TO JURISDICTION 1

OPINION BELOW 1

JURISDICTION 2

QUESTIONS PRESENTED 4

STATUTES AND CONSTITUTIONAL PROVISIONS INVOLVED 4

CONCLUSION 13

TABLE OF CASES

Alexander v. Holmes County Board of Education, 396 U. S. 19, 90 S. Ct. 29 10

Atlantic Coastline Railroad v. Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, No. 477, October Term, 1969, Opinion filed June 8, 1970 13

Bell v. School City of Gary, Indiana, 324 F. 2d 209, cert. den. 377 U. S. 924 8

Blue v. Durham Public School District, 95 F. Supp. 441 12

Board of Education of Oklahoma City Public Schools v. Dowell, 375 F. 2d 158, cert. den. 387 U. S. 931 8

Board of Public Instruction of Duval County, Florida, v. Braxton, 402 F. 2d 900 8

Brown v. Board of Education, 347 U. S. 483, 74 S. Ct. 686, 98 L. ed. 873 7

Brown v. Board of Education of Topeka, 349 U. S. 294, 99 L. ed. 1083, 75 S. Ct. 753 7

Brown v. Charlotte-Mecklenburg Board of Education, 267 N. C. 740, 743, 149 S. E. 2d 10 11

Bradley v. School Board of Richmond, 345 F. 2d 310, 315, 316 7

Constantian v. Anson County, 244 N. C. 221, 93 S. E. 2d 163 12

Covington v. Edwards, 264 F. 2d 780 (CCA-4) 13

Deal v. Cincinnati Board of Education, 369 F. 2d 55, cert. den. 389 U. S. 847 8

Department of Employment v. United States, 385 U. S. 355, 87 S. Ct. 464, 17 L. ed. 2d 414 3

Dilday v. Board of Education, 267 N. C. 438, 148 S. E. 2d 513 12

Down v. Board of Education of Kansas City, 336 F. 2d 988, cert. den. 380 U. S. 914 8

Florida Lime & Avocado Growers, Inc. v. Jacobsen, 362 U. S. 73, 8 S. Ct. 568, 4 L. ed. 2d 568 2

Grave v. Board of Education of North Little Rock, Arkansas, School District, 299 F. Supp. 843 8

Huff v. Board of Education, 259 N. C. 75, 130 S. E. 2d 26 11

In Re Hays, 261 N. C. 616, 135 S. E. 2d 645 12

Jeffers v. Whitley, 165 F. Supp. 951 13

McKissick v. Durham City Board of Education, 176 F. Supp. 3 13

Mitchell v. Donovan, No. 726, October Term, 1969, Opinion filed June 15, 1970 13

Northcross v. Board of Education of Memphis, ____ U. S. ____, 25 L. ed. 2d 246, 90 S. Ct. ____ 10

Palmetto Fire Insurance Company v. Conn, 272 U. S. 205, 47 S. Ct. 88, 71 L. ed. 243 3

Sparrow v. Gill, 304 F. Supp. 86 11

United States v. Jefferson County Board of Education, 372 F. 2d 836, 879 8

Zemel v. Rusk, 381 U. S. 1, 85 S. Ct. 1271, 14 L. ed. 2d 179 3

STATUTES

General Statutes of North Carolina, §115-176.1 ..... 2, 3, 4, 5

General Statutes of North Carolina, §115-180 10

General Statutes of North Carolina, §115-181 11

General Statutes of North Carolina, Chapter 115, Article 22

28 USC 1253 2

42 USC 2000c 5, 6

42 USC 2000c-6 5

APPENDIX 14

FINAL JUDGMENT 15

OPINION OF 3-JUDGE COURT 16

DESIGNATION OF 3-JUDGE COURT 30

NOTIFICATION AND REQUEST FOR DESIGNATION OF 3-JUDGE COURT 32

SUPPLEMENTAL COMPLAINT 36

ORDER TO ADD DEFENDANTS AND TO FILE SUPPLEMENTAL COMPLAINT 50

MOTION FOR SUPPLEMENTAL COMPLAINT AND ADDITIONAL DEFENDANTS 51

ANSWER TO SUPPLEMENTAL COMPLAINT 55

MOTION FOR FURTHER RELIEF AND ADDITIONAL DEFENDANTS 59

ORDER ALLOWING ADDITIONAL DEFENDANTS 65

ANSWER TO MOTION TO ADD ADDITIONAL DEFENDANTS AND FOR FURTHER RELIEF 69

DEPOSITION OF JAMES H. CARSON, JR. 76

In The

Supreme Court of the United States

OCTOBER TERM, 1970

No. _____

NORTH CAROLINA STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION; DR. A. CRAIG PHILLIPS, Superintendent of Public Instruction; HONORABLE ROBERT W. SCOTT, Governor of the State of North Carolina; HONORABLE A. C. DAVIS, Controller of the State Board of Education; HONORABLE WILLIAM K. McLEAN, Judge of the Superior Court of Mecklenburg County, et al.,

Appellants,

v.

JAMES E. SWANN, et al.,

Appellees.

APPEAL FROM THE DISTRICT COURT OF THE UNITED STATES FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF NORTH CAROLINA

STATEMENT AS TO JURISDICTION

The appellants, pursuant to United States Supreme Court Rules 13 and 15, file this statement as to jurisdiction, setting forth the basis upon which it is contended that the Supreme Court of the United States has jurisdiction on a direct appeal from an opinion and judgment of a 3-judge federal court to review the final judgment in question, and, further, that this Court should exercise such jurisdiction in this case.

OPINION BELOW

The 3-Judge Federal District Court for the Western District of North Carolina filed its written opinion on April 29, 1970; this opinion is not yet reported. A copy of the opinion is attached to the Jurisdictional Statement and appears on p. 16 of the Appendix attached hereto.

JURISDICTION

The appeal herein is from a judgment decided by a 3-judge federal court organized in the Western District of North Carolina and filed in the Office of the Clerk of the Court for the Western District of North Carolina on June 22, 1970, the same being a final judgment. In this judgment the 3-Judge Federal Court held unconstitutional and invalid a portion of a statute of North Carolina (Section 115-176.1 of the General Statutes of North Carolina—1969 Cumulative Supplement to Volume 3A) which said portion reads as follows:

> "No student shall be assigned or compelled to attend any school on account of race, creed, color or national origin, or for the purpose of creating balance or ratio of race, religion or national origins. Involuntary busing of students in contravention of this article is prohibited, and pubilc funds shall not be used for any such busing."

The 3-Judge Federal District Court further held that except for the portion above quoted the State statute was constitutional and valid.

The complete statute appears on p. 19 of the Appendix attached hereto.

The final judgment signed by the 3-Judge Federal Court declaring this portion of the State statute unconstitutional and restraining any action to enforce same on the part of the appellants is set forth on p. 15 of the Appendix attached hereto.

The Supreme Court of the United States has jurisdiction to review by direct appeal the opinion and judgment of the 3-Judge District Court of the United States herein complained of by virtue of the provisions of 28 USC 1253. This is also a question that arises under the provisions of the Constitution of the United States.

The following decisions sustain the jurisdiction of the Supreme Court of the United States to review this opinion and judgment on direct appeal in this case: FLORIDA LIME &

AVOCADO GROWERS, INC. v. JACOBSEN, 362 U. S. 73, 8 S. Ct. 568, 4 L. ed. 2d 568; ZEMEL v. RUSK, 381 U. C. 1, 85 S. Ct. 1271, 14 L. ed. 2d 179; PALMETTO FIRE INS. CO. v. CONN, 272 U. S. 205, 47 S. Ct. 88, 71 L. ed. 243; DEPARTMENT OF EMPLOYMENT v. UNITED STATES, 385 U. S. 355, 87 S. Ct. 464, 17 L. ed. 2d 414.

It is to be noted that the 3-Judge Federal Court granted an injunction against all of the State officers restraining them from carrying out the provisions of the statute above cited. This would seem to bring the case directly in line with the decisions where this Court will take jurisdiction and hear such an appeal.

It should be emphasized that the appellants do not question the organization of the 3-Judge Federal Court. The appellants concede that the constitutionality of the State statute was a proper case which requires a 3-judge court to pass upon the constitutional and injunctive issue. It is further conceded that the 3-Judge Federal Court was properly organized under a proper order, and, therefore, the jurisdiction of the 3-Judge Court to hear the case is not questioned.

The portion of Sec. 115-176.1 (1969 Supplement to Volume 3A) of the statutes of North Carolina declared to be unconstitutional consists of two sentences in said statute which we again quote, as follows:

> "No student shall be assigned or compelled to attend any school on account of race, creed, color or national origin, or for the purpose of creating balance or ratio of race, religion or national origins. Involuntary busing of students in contravention of this article is prohibited, and public funds shall not be used for such busing."

The 3-Judge Federal Court construed these two sentences to mean that they prohibited assignment by race and would prevent school boards from altering existing dual systems. Apparently the Court construed the word "balance" as prohibiting a school board from establishing the so-called Unitary System, and the Court said this violated the equal protection clause of the Fourteenth Amendment. Aside from the constitutional implications involved in the statute, we think the

Court has incorrectly construed the language of the statute since the 3-Judge Court evidently thought that the language substantially prohibited all busing.

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

THE 3-JUDGE FEDERAL DISTRICT COURT FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF NORTH CAROLINA ERRED, AS FOLLOWS:

I. IN HOLDING AND CONCLUDING THAT THE NORTH CAROLINA STATUTE ABOVE QUOTED VIOLATED THE EQUAL PROTECTION CLAUSE OF THE FOURTEENTH AMENDMENT.

II. IN ERRONEOUSLY CONSTRUING THE WORD "BALANCE" AS USED IN THE NORTH CAROLINA STATUTE TO BE A PROHIBITION AGAINST RACIAL ADJUSTMENT IN THE ORGANIZATION OF A PUBLIC SCHOOL SYSTEM AND IN CONSTRUING THE STATUTE TO MEAN THAT BUSING SHOULD NOT BE RESORTED TO BUT AS FLATLY PROHIBITING BUSING.

III. IN HOLDING IN SUBSTANCE THAT THE STATE HAS NO CONTROL OVER THE EXPENDITURE OF ITS FUNDS, BUT, TO THE CONTRARY, MUST EXPEND ITS FUNDS ACCORDING TO THE DICTATION OF THE FEDERAL COURT.

IV. IN FAILING TO DISMISS THE ACTION AS AGAINST THE STATE OFFICIALS WHO ARE NOT CONCERNED WITH THE BUSING OF THE PUPILS WHICH IS PURELY THE FUNCTION OF THE LOCAL SCHOOL UNITS.

STATUTES AND CONSTITUTIONAL PROVISIONS INVOLVED

N.C.G.S. 115-176.1 (The portion of this statute as quoted above); *Article 22 of Chapter 115* of the General Statutes of

North Carolina (Dealing with the rights and duties as to the busing of public school pupils).

Section 115-176.1 of the North Carolina General Statutes is constitutional

This portion of the statute simply prohibits compulsory attendance or assignment of any pupil to a public school on account of race, creed, or national origin, for the express purpose of creating a balance or ratio of race, religion or national origins. It also prohibits involuntary busing of students "in contravention of this article" and provides that public funds shall not be used for such busing.

This is in line with the enactment of the Congress in the Civil Rights Act of 1964. In the definition of "desegregation" in subsection (b) of 42 USC 2000c it is expressly said: "'Desegregation' shall not mean the assignment of students to public schools to overcome racial imbalance." Likewise, in 42 USC 2000c-6, it is provided in subsection (a) (2), as follows:

> "Provided that nothing herein shall empower any official or court of the United States to issue any order seeking to achieve a racial balance in any school by requiring the transportation of pupils or students from one school to another or one school district to another in order to achieve such racial balance."

Apparently Senator Humphrey, when this matter was being debated on the floor of the Senate, held an opinion quite contrary to the order of the Court in this matter. In 110 Congressional Record 12717, we find the following:

> "Mr. Humphrey * * * I should like to make one further reference to the Gary case. This case makes it quite clear that while the Constitution prohibits segregation, it does not require integration * * * . The bill does not attempt to integrate the schools but it does attempt to eliminate segregation in the schools * * * . The fact that there is a racial imbalance per se is not something which is unconstitutional. That is why we have attempted to clarify it with the language in Section 4."

It is submitted that the definition of "desegregation" is on a par with the congressional definition, which is found in subsection (b) of 42 USC 2000c, which is as follows:

> "'Desegregation' means the assignment of students to public schools and within such schools without regard to their race, religion, or national origin, but 'desegregation' shall not mean the assignment of students to public schools in order to overcome racial imbalance."

If the first sentence of the State Statute is therefore unconstitutional, then the Congressional Act is likewise unconstitutional and invalid. If this sentence is unconstitutional, then that portion of the State statute which forbids exclusion from a school on the basis of race is also uncontstitutional for these two statutory prohibitions are different statements of the same thing. The first of these provisions says to the school authorities that you cannot require a child because of his race to stay away from any given school. The second provision says to the school authorities you cannot require a child, because of his race, to enter any given school. The thrust of these two provisions is that school attendance based entirely on race is prohibited.

The holding of the 3-Judge Federal Court in this case should be scrutinized closely from a constitutional standpoint. What the District Court has done, as well as courts elsewhere, is simply to convert a civil right or civil liberty into a civil obligation analogous to the obligation of compulsory conscription for military purposes.

The whole scheme of busing pupils on a racial basis to remove a racial imbalance in a public school is not only a dictatorial exertion of power on the part of the judiciary but is a confusion between civil rights and civil obligations. It means that parents and pupils must submit to the judge's choice of the schools they shall attend based upon the color of their skin to accomplish a fictitious governmental purpose. It simply means that black people or white people are directed by judicial dictat to go to one school rather than to another. Judicial dictation or tyranny by an all-powerful government is not removed because it is done in the name of equality. In

other words, black people, or, for that matter, white people, are under a governmental obligation to associate with whomever the government chooses because the government has decided to compel such association, and, therefore, the civil right to associate with whomsoever citizens choose to associate with is not a right but a governmental obligation. If this doctrine is pushed to the limits of its logic, then the Fourteenth Amendment is constitutional authority for totalitarianism for the government can deprive citizens of their rights or of their civil liberties if it merely deprives all citizens equally of such liberty or right.

If a black person enters a common carrier, such as a bus, he has a right to sit down at the front of the bus where the white people were formerly accustomed to having their seats, or he has a right to go to the back of the bus where the black people were formerly seated. He may choose any seat on the bus he desires, but if he decides to sit at the back of the bus, it is submitted that the bus driver has no constitutional right to go back and seize him by the collar and drag him up to front of the bus. In this connection certain language in the case of BRADLEY v. SCHOOL BOARD OF RICHMOND, 345 F. 2d 310, 315, 316 (4th Cir. 1965), the Court dealt with the argument of certain black plaintiffs who wished their children to attend schools predominantly attended by black people. The Court said:

> "To that extent, they (plaintiffs) say that, under any freedom of choice system, the state 'permits' segregation if it does not deprive Negro parents of a right of choice. * * * There is nothing in the Constitution which prevents his voluntary association with others of his race or which would strike down any state law which permits such association. The present suggestion that a Negro's right to be free from discrimination requires that the state deprive him of his volition is incongruous."

There is nothing in Brown I or Brown II that supports the ruling of the Court (BROWN v. BOARD OF EDUCATION, 347 U. S. 483, 74 S. Ct. 686, 98 L. ed. 873; BROWN v. BOARD OF EDUCATION OF TOPEKA, 349 U. S. 294,

99 L. ed. 1083, 75 S. Ct. 753). It is noticeable, and, in fact, it should be emphasized, that Brown II is utterly silent as to redressing racial imbalance, but, to the contrary, deals with school districts and attendance areas. The Court said:

> "The burden rests upon the defendants to establish at such time as is necessary in the public interest and is consistent with good faith compliance at the earliest practicable date. To that end, the courts may consider problems related to administration, arising from the physical condition of the school plant, the school transportation system, personnel, revision of school districts and attendance areas into compact units to achieve a system of determining admission to the public schools on a nonracial basis, and revision of local laws and regulations which may be necessary in solving the foregoing problems."

It is submitted, therefore, that nondiscriminatory zoning or attendance areas related to the neighborhood school to which pupils are admitted on a nonracial basis is the proper solution (see: BELL v. SCHOOL CITY OF GARY, INDIANA (CCA-7), 324 F. 2d 209, cert. den. 377 U. S. 924; UNITED STATES v. JEFFERSON COUNTY BOARD OF EDUCATION (CCA-5), 372 F.2d 836, 879; DEAL v. CINCINNATI BOARD OF EDUCATION, 369 F. 2d 55 (CCA-6), cert. den. 389 U. S. 847; BOARD OF PUBLIC INSTRUCTION OF DUVAL COUNTY, FLORIDA v. BRAXTON (CCA-5), 402 F. 2d 900; DOWN v. BOARD OF EDUCATION OF KANSAS CITY (CCA-10), 336 F. 2d 988, cert. den. 380 U. S. 914; BOARD OF EDUCATION OF OKLAHOMA CITY PUBLIC SCHOOLS v. DOWELL (CCA-10), 375 F. 2d 158, cert. den. 387 U. S. 931; GRAVE v. BOARD OF EDUCATION OF NORTH LITTLE ROCK, ARKANSAS SCHOOL DISTRICT, 299 F. Supp. 843).

The mention of the school transportation system in Brown II refers to the existing school transportation and not to the creation of new transportation systems to redress racial imbalance.

An examination of the orders entered by District Judge McMillan, as shown in the Appendix to Petition for Certiorari

in No. 1713, October Term, 1969, already before this Court, will show that the District Judge has proposed to organize the public schools of Charlotte on the basis of mathematical ratios and not only do this but keep students in constant motion, moving from one school to another during the term, based upon computer calculations.

If what we have said as to the constitutionality of the first sentence in the judgment below is true, then the second sentence, which prohibits the expenditure of public funds for involuntary busing to redress racial imbalance, is also a valid exercise of State power.

> *The statute does not prohibit normal transportation for a public school system. It only prohibits busing to relieve a racial imbalance or to provide public schools whose attendance is based on mathematical ratios.*

It seems quite clear to us that the 3-Judge Court has misconstrued the language of the statute. Among other things, the Court said:

> "Stated differently, a statute favoring the neighborhood school concept, freedom-of-choice plans, or both, can validly limit a school board's choice of remedy only if the policy favored will not prevent the operation of a unitary system. That it may or may not depends upon the facts in a particular school system. The flaw in this legislation is its rigidity. As an expression of State policy, it is valid. To the extent that it may interfere with the board's performance of its affirmative constitutional duty to establish a unitary system, it is invalid."

What the Court is really saying is that students may be bused to rectify a racial imbalance or to conform to a mathematical ratio. In another part of the opinion the Court said:

> "The second and third sentences are unconstitutional. They plainly prohibit school boards from assigning, compelling, or involuntarily busing students on account of race, or in order to racially 'balance' the school system."

What the Court has really said is that there must be a unitary system without defining the unitary system. The Court has also said that students may be bused to establish racial balance, or, in other words, to correct a racial imbalance, which is the very thing prohibited by the Civil Rights Act of 1964. It seems strange that the Congress can prohibit this course of action and yet the State cannot prohibit the same course or type of action. The Court furthermore assumes that busing to redress racial imbalance is a constitutionally approved governmental objective and is a required constitutional obligation which has yet to be decided, and as far as this Court has gone is to say that a unitary system was one "within which no person is to be effectively excluded from any school because of race or color." (ALEXANDER v. HOLMES COUNTY BOARD OF EDUCATION, 396 U. S. 19, 90 S. Ct. 29, quoted in concurring opinion in NORTHCROSS v. BOARD OF EDUCATION OF MEMPHIS, ____ U. S. ____, 25 L. ed. 2d 246, 90 S. Ct. ____) Thus it will be seen that the Court has exceeded that part of the definition already given.

The Court also overlooks the fact that neither the local board of education nor the State defendants are compelled to operate a transportation system.

In Section 115-180 of the General Statutes of North Carolina it is said:

> "Each county board of education, and each city board of education is hereby authorized, but is not required, to acquire, own and operate school buses for the transportation of pupils enrolled in the public schools of such county or city administrative unit and all persons employed in the operation of such schools within the limitations set forth in this subchapter. Each such board may operate such buses to and from such of the schools within the county or city administrative unit, and in such number, as the board shall from time to time find practicable and appropriate for the safe, orderly and efficient transportation of such pupils and employees of such schools."

The State Board of Education has no authority over the transportation of pupils. In a portion of Section 115-181 of the General Statutes of North Carolina we find the following:

> "(a) The State Board of Education shall not have authority over or control of the transportation of pupils and employees upon any school bus owned and operated by any county or city board of education, except as provided in this subchapter.
>
> "(b) The State Board of Education shall be under no duty to supply transportation to any pupil or employee enrolled or employed in any school. Neither the State nor the State Board of Education shall in any manner be liable for the failure or refusal of any county or city board of education to furnish transportation, by school bus or otherwise, to any pupil or employee of any school, or for any neglect or action of any county or city board of education, or any employee of any such board, in the operation or maintenance of any school bus."

The State Board of Education does allocate to the respective county and city boards of education all funds appropriated from time to time by the General Assembly for the purpose of providing transportation to the pupils enrolled in the public schools within the State. These funds are allocated according to the number of pupils to be transported, the length of bus routes, road conditions and all other circumstances affecting the cost of transportation of pupils. The Superintendent of Public Instruction of the State has no duties in regard to transportation and the Governor of the State has no duties relating to school transportation. The Supreme Court of North Carolina has construed these statutes to relieve the State Board of Education from all duties in the field of transportation (HUFF v. BOARD OF EDUCATION, 259 N. C. 75, 130 S. E. 2d 26; BROWN v. CHARLOTTE-MECKLENBURG BOARD OF EDUCATION, 267 N. C. 740, 743, 149 S. E. 2d 10). And in the case of SPARROW v. GILL, 304 F. Supp. 86 (1969), a 3-judge federal court said:

> "The State may allocate its funds on any basis it chooses

—or may cut off funds entirely—so long as it does not capriciously favor one group of citizens over another."

The order of the 3-Judge Court, therefore, requires the State to furnish funds to provide public school busing to redress a racial imbalance even though the amount of such funds exceeds the amount appropriated for normal transportation or exceeds the entire appropriation of the General Assembly. We do not contend that school boards are prohibited from changing the racial organization of any particular school facility to provide constitutional schools and that buses may be used to transport to any of the facilities. We do contend that children cannot be changed around and bused far beyond the school in a pupil's residence area simply to redress racial imbalance or that pupils may be moved around during the school term to maintain mathematical ratios.

The holding of the 3-Judge Court deprives the State of control over its funds.

While we have already discussed to some extent this subject, it should be stated that we are not aware of the proposition that a 3-judge federal court may order a State to expend its funds in a particular manner or to require the General Assembly of a State to appropriate funds according to the federal court. It has not yet been held by this Court that a State is required and that it is its constitutional duty to furnish funds according to some federal judicial formula.

The Court erred in failing to sustain the Motion to Dismiss all of the State defendants.

All federal judges in the State of North Carolina, except one, have held that the State Board of Education, the State Superintendent of Public Instruction and other State officers do not control and administer the public school system but such power is lodged in the local units (CONSTANTIAN v. ANSON COUNTY, 244 N. C. 221, 93 S. E. 2d 163; DILDAY v. BOARD OF EDUCATION, 267 N. C. 438, 148 S. E. 2d 513; IN RE HAYS, 261 N. C. 616, 135 S. E. 2d 645; BLUE v. DURHAM PUBLIC SCHOOL DISTRICT, 95 F. Supp.

441; JEFFERS v. WHITLEY, 165 F. Supp. 951; McKISSICK v. DURHAM CITY BOARD OF EDUCATION, 176 F. Supp. 3).

In the case of COVINGTON v. EDWARDS, CCA-4, 264 F. 2d 780, the United States Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit upheld this same principle. The 3-Judge Federal Court, therefore, should have dismissed this action against all the defendants. The defendant, Judge McLean, should not have been restrained from proceeding with the suit in the State Court (MITCHELL v. DONOVAN, No. 726, October Term, 1969, Opinion filed June 15, 1970; ATLANTIC COASTLINE RAILROAD v. BROTHERHOOD OF LOCOMOTIVE ENGINEERS, No. 477, October Term, 1969, Opinion filed June 8, 1970).

CONCLUSION

We conclude, therefore, that this Court should accept jurisdiction in this case. We further assert that quotas for religious minorities are not approved; quotas have been revised in our national immigration laws; quotas in alien employment rights have not been approved. We submit that quotas should not be approved in the public school system as between the races anymore than proportional representation in the jury system which this Court has expressly diapproved. Black pupils are entitled to go to the public schools on the same basis as white pupils and all this Court has decided in the *Brown Cases* is that the State must eliminate State sources of racial discrimination.

Respectfully submitted,

ROBERT B. MORGAN
Attorney General of the
State of North Carolina.

RALPH MOODY
Deputy Attorney General of
the State of North Carolina

ANDREW A. VANORE, JR.
Assistant Attorney General of
the State of North Carolina

P. O. Box 629
Justice Building
Raleigh, North Carolina 27602
Telephone: 829-3377

APPENDIX

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF NORTH CAROLINA
CHARLOTTE DIVISION
Civil No. 1974

JAMES E. SWANN, et al, — Plaintiffs,

versus

CHARLOTTE-MECKLENBURG BOARD OF EDUCATION, a public body corporate; WILLIAM E. POE; HENDERSON BELK; DAN HOOD; BEN F. HUNTLEY; BETSEY KELLY; COLEMAN W. KERRY, JR.; JULIA MAULDEN; SAM McNINCH, III; CARLTON G. WATKINS; THE NORTH CAROLINA STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION, a public body corporate; and DR. A. CRAIG PHILLIPS, Superintendent of Public Instruction of the State of North Carolina, — Defendants,

and

HONORABLE ROBERT W. SCOTT, Governor of the State of North Carolina; HONORABLE A. C. DAVIS, Controller of the State Department of Public Instruction; HONORABLE WILLIAM K. McLEAN, Judge of the Superior Court of Mecklenburg County; TOM B. HARRIS; G. DON ROBERSON; A. BREECE BRELAND; JAMES M. POSTELL; WILLIAM E. RORIE, JR.; CHALMERS R. CARR; ROBERT T. WILSON; and the CONCERNED PARENTS ASSOCIATION, an unincorporated association in Mecklenburg County; JAMES CARSON and WILLIAM H. BOOE, — Additional Parties Defendant.

CIVIL NO. 2631

MRS. ROBERT LEE MOORE, et al, Plaintiffs,

versus

CHARLOTTE-MECKLENBURG BOARD OF EDUCATION and WILLIAM C. SELF, Superintendent of Charlotte-Mecklenburg Public Schools, Defendants.

FINAL JUDGMENT

Upon reconsideration of our memorandum opinion filed April 28, 1970, we withdraw Part V.

It is now ORDERED, ADJUDGED and DECREED that the following portion of N. C. General Statute 115-176.1 prohibiting assignment by race and bussing be and hereby is held unconstitutional, void, and of no effect:

> No student shall be assigned or compelled to attend any school on account of race, creed, color or national origin, or for the purpose of creating a balance or ratio of race, religion or national origins. Involuntary bussing of students in contravention of this article is prohibited, and public funds shall not be used for any such bussing.

All parties are hereby enjoined from enforcing, or seeking the enforcement of, the foregoing portion of the statute.

Plaintiff's motion to hold defendants in contempt is denied; the various motions to dismiss are denied.

This 22 day of June, 1970.

J. Braxton Craven
United States Circuit Judge

John D. Butzner, Jr.
United States Circuit Judge

James B. McMillan
United States District Judge

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF NORTH CAROLINA
CHARLOTTE DIVISION
Civil No. 1974

JAMES E. SWANN, et al., Plaintiffs,

versus

CHARLOTTE-MECKLENBURG BOARD OF EDUCATION, a public body corporate; WILLIAM E. POE; HENDERSON BELK; DAN HOOD; BEN F. HUNTLEY; BETSEY KELLY; COLEMAN W. KERRY, JR.; JULIA MAULDEN; SAM McNINCH, III; CARLTON G. WATKINS; THE NORTH CAROLINA STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION, a public body corporate; and DR. A. CRAIG PHILLIPS, Superintendent of Public Instruction of the State of North Carolina, Defendants,

and

HONORABLE ROBERT W. SCOTT, Governor of the State of North Carolina; HONORABLE A. C. DAVIS, Controller of the State Department of Public Instruction; HONORABLE WILLIAM K. McLEAN, Judge of the Superior Court of Mecklenburg County; TOM B. HARRIS; G. DON ROBERSON; A. BREECE BRELAND; JAMES M. POSTELL; WILLIAM E. RORIE, JR.; CHALMERS R. CARR; ROBERT T. WILSON; and the CONCERNED PARENTS ASSOCIATION, an unincorporated association in Mecklenburg County; JAMES CARSON and WILLIAM H. BOOE, Additional Parties Defendant.

Civil No. 2631

MRS. ROBERT LEE MOORE, et al., Plaintiffs,

versus

CHARLOTTEE-MECKLENBURG BOARD OF EDUCATION and WILLIAM C. SELF, Superintendent of Charlotte-Mecklenburg Public Schools, Defendants.

THREE-JUDGE COURT

(Heard March 24, 1970 Decided April 29, 1970.)

Before CRAVEN and BUTZNER, Circuit Judges, and McMILLAN, District Judge.

Mr. J. LeVonne Chambers (Chambers, Stein, Ferguson & Lanning) and James M. Nabrit, III, for Plaintiffs in No. 1974; Mr. William J. Waggoner (Weinstein, Waggoner, Sturges, Odom & Bigger) and Mr. Benjamin Horack, for Defendants in No. 1974; Mr. Ralph Moody, Deputy Attorney General, and Mr. Andrew A. Vanore, Jr., Assistant Attorney General, for State Defendants and Additional Parties-Defendant in No. 1974; and Mr. William H. Booe and Mr. Whiteford S. Blakeney, for other Additional Parties-Defendant in No. 1974.

Mr. William H. Booe and Mr. Whiteford S. Blakeney for Plaintiffs in No. 2631; and Mr. William J. Waggoner (Weinstein, Waggoner, Sturges, Odom & Bigger) for Defendants in No. 2631.

CRAVEN, Circuit Judge:

This three-judge district court was convened pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2281, et seq. (1964), to consider a single aspect of the above-captioned case: the constitutionality and impact of a state statute, N. C. Gen. Stat. § 115-176.1 (Supp. 1969), known as the antibussing law, on this suit brought to de-

segregate the Charlotte-Mecklenburg school system. We hold a portion of N. C. Gen. Stat. § 115-176.1 unconstitutional because it may interfere with the school board's performance of its affirmative constitutional duty under the equal protection clause of the Fourteenth Amendment.

I.

On February 5, 1970, the district court entered an order requiring the Charlotte-Mecklenburg School Board to desegregate its school system according to a court-approved plan. Implementation of the plan could require that 13,300 additional children be bussed.[1] This, in turn, could require up to 138 additional school buses.[2]

Prior to the February 5 order, certain parties filed a suit, entitled *Tom B. Harris, G. Don Roberson, et al. v. William C. Self, Superintendent of Charlotte-Mecklenburg Schools and Charlotte-Mecklenburg Board of Education,* in the Superior Court of Mecklenburg County, a court of general jurisdiction of the State of North Carolina. Part of the relief sought was an order enjoining the expenditure of public funds to purchase, rent or operate any motor vehicle for the purpose of transporting students pursuant to a desegregation plan. A temporary restraining order granting this relief was entered by the state court, and, in response, the *Swann* plaintiffs moved the district court to add the state plaintiffs as additional parties defendant in the federal suit, to dissolve the state restraining order, and to direct all parties to cease interfering with the federal court mandates. Because it appeared that the con-

---

1. On March 5, 1970, the Fourth Circuit Court of Appeals stayed that portion of the district court's order requiring bussing of students pending appeal to the higher court.

2. There is a dispute between the parties as to the additional number of children who will be bussed and as to the number of additional buses that will be needed. For our purposes, it is immaterial whose figures are correct. The figures quoted are taken from the district judge's supplemental findings of fact, filed March 21, 1970.

stitutionality of N. C. Gen. Stat. § 115-176.1 (Supp. 1969) would be in question, the district court requested designation of this three-judge court on February 19, 1970. On February 25, 1970, the district judge granted the motion to add additional parties. Meanwhile, on February 22, 1970, another state suit, styled *Mrs. Robert Lee Moore, et al. v. Charlotte-Mecklenburg Board of Education and William C. Self, Superintendent of Charlotte-Mecklenburg Schools,* was begun. In this second state suit, the plaintiffs also requested an order enjoining the school board and superintendent from implementing the plan ordered by the district court on February 5. The state court judge issued a temporary restraining order embodying the relief requested, and on February 26, 1970, the *Swann* plaintiffs moved to add Mrs. Moore, *et al.*, as additional parties defendant in the federal suit. On the same day, the state defendants filed a petition for removal of the *Moore* suit to federal court. On March 23, 1970, the district judge requested a three-judge court in the removed *Moore* case, and this panel was designated to hear the matter. All the cases were consolidated for hearing, and the court heard argument by all parties on March 24, 1970.

II.

N. C. Gen. Stat. § 115-176.1 (Supp. 1969) reads:

> Assignment of pupils based on race, creed, color or national origin prohibited.—No person shall be refused admission into or be excluded from any public school in this State on account of race, creed, color or national origin. No school attendance district or zone shall be drawn for the purpose of segregating persons of various races, creeds, colors or national origins from the community.
>
> Where administrative units have divided the geographic area into attendance districts or zones, pupils shall be assigned to schools within such attendance districts; provided, however, that the board of education of an administrative unit may assign any pupil to a school outside of such

attendance district or zone in order that such pupil may attend a school of a specialized kind including but not limited to a vocational school or school operated for, or operating programs for, pupils mentally or physically handicapped, or for any other reason which the board of education in its sole discretion deems sufficient. No student shall be assigned or compelled to attend any school on account of race, creed, color or national origin, or for the purpose of creating a balance or ratio of race, religion or national origins. Involuntary bussing of students in contravention of this article is prohibited, and public funds shall not be used for any such bussing.

The provisions of this article shall not apply to a temporary assignment due to the unsuitability of a school for its intended purpose nor to any assignment or transfer necessitated by overcrowded conditions or other circumstances which, in the sole discretion of the school board, require assignment or reassignment.

The provisions of this article shall not apply to an application for the assignment or reassignment by the parent, guardian or person standing in loco parentis of any pupil or to any assignment made pursuant to a choice made by any pupil who is eligible to make such choice pursuant to the provisions of a freedom of choice plan voluntarily adopted by the board of education of an administrative unit.

It is urged upon us that the statute is far from clear and may reasonably be interpreted several different ways.

(A) Plaintiffs read the statute to mean that the school board is prevented from complying with its duty under the Fourteenth Amendment to establish a unitary school system. See, *e.g.*, *Green v. County School Bd. of New Kent County*, 391 U.S. 430, 439 (1968). In support of this contention, plaintiffs argue that the North Carolina General Assembly passed § 115-176.1 in response to an April 23,

1969, district court order, which required the school board to submit a plan to desegregate the Charlotte schools for the 1969-70 school year. Under plaintiffs' interpretation of the statute, the board is denied all desegregation tools except nongerrymandered geographic zoning and freedom of choice. Implicit in this, of course, is the suggestion that zoning and freedom of choice will be ineffective in the Charlotte context to disestablish the asserted duality of the present system.

(B) The North Carolina Attorney General argues that the statute was passed to preserve the neighborhood school concept. Under his interpretation, the statute prohibits assignment and bussing inconsistent with the neighborhood school concept. Thus, to disestablish a dual system the district court could, consistent with the statute, *only* order the board to geographically zone the attendance areas so that, as nearly as possible, each student would be assigned to the school nearest his home regardless of his race. Implicit in this argument is that any school system is *per se* unitary if it is zoned according to neighborhood patterns that are not the result of officially sanctioned racial discrimination. Although the Attorney General emphasizes the expression of state policy by the Legislature in favor of the neighborhood school concept, he recognizes, of course, that the statute also permits freedom of choice if a school board voluntarily adopts such a plan. Thus, the plaintiffs and the Attorney General read the statute in much the same way: that it limits lawful methods of accomplishing desegregation to nongerrymandered geographic zoning and freedom of choice.

(C) The school board's interpretation of the statute is more ingenious. The board concedes that the statute prohibits assignment according to race, assignment to achieve racial balance, and involuntary bussing for either of these purposes, but contends that the facial prohibitions of the statute only apply to prevent a school board from doing

more than necessary to attain a unitary system. The argument is that since the statute only begins to operate once a unitary system has been established, it in no way interferes with the board's constitutional duty to desegrate the schools. Counsel goes on to insist that Charlotte-Mecklenburg presently has a unitary system and, therefore, that the state court constitutionally applied the statute to prevent further unnecessary racial balancing.

(D) Plaintiffs in the *Harris* suit contend (1) that in 42 U.S.C. §§ 2000c(b) and 2000c-6(a) (2) (1964)[3] Congress expressly prohibited assignment and bussing to achieve racial balance, (2) that to compel a child to attend a school on account of his race or to compel him to be involuntarily bussed to achieve a racial balance violates the principle of *Brown v. Bd. of Ed. of Topeka*, 347 U.S. 483 (1954), and (3) that N. C. Gen. Stat. § 115-176.1 merely embodies the principle of the neighborhood school in accordance with *Brown* and the Civil Rights Act of 1964. We may dispose of the first contention at once. The statute "cannot be interpreted to frustrate the constitutional prohibition [against segregated schools]." *United*

3.

§ 2000c:

As used in this subchapter—

(b) "Desegregation" means the assignment of students to public schools and within such schools without regard to their race, color, religion, or national origin, but "desegregation" shall not mean the assignment of students to public schools in order to overcome racial imbalance.

§ 2000c-6(a):

(2) [P]rovided that nothing herein shall empower any official or court of the United States to issue any order seeking to achieve a racial balance in any school by requiring the transportation of pupils or students from one school to another or one school district to another in order to achieve such racial balance, or otherwise enlarge the existing power of the court to insure compliance with constitutional standards.

States v. School Dist. 151 of Cook Co., 404 F. 2d 1125, 1130 (7th Cir. 1968).

(E) Plaintiffs in the *Moore* suit argue that the district court order of February 5, 1970, was in contravention of *Brown* and, therefore, that the state court order in their suit was justified. However, the *Moore* plaintiffs also argue that certain parts of the second and third paragraphs in the state statute are unconstitutional because they give the school board the authority to assign children to schools for whatever reasons the board deems necessary or sufficient. The *Moore* plaintiffs interpret these portions of the statute as permitting assignment and bussing on the basis of race contrary to *Brown* and the Fourteenth Amendment.

III.

Federal courts are reluctant, as a matter of comity and respect for state legislative judgment and discretion, to strike down state statutes as unconstitutional, and will not do so if the statute reasonably can be interpreted so as not to conflict with the federal Constitution. But to read the statute as innocuously as the school board suggests would, we think, distort and twist the legislative intent. We agree with plaintiffs and the Attorney General that the statute limits the remedies otherwise available to school boards to desegregate the schools. The harder question is whether the limitation is valid or conflicts with the Fourteenth Amendment. We think the question is not so easy, and the statute not so obviously unconstitutional, that the question may lawfully be answered by a single federal judge, see *Turner v. City of Memphis*, 369 U. S. 350 (1962); *Bailey v. Patterson*, 369 U. S. 31 (1962), and we reject plaintiffs' attack upon our jurisdiction. *Swift & Co. v. Wickham*, 382 U. S. 111 (1965); C. Wright, Law of Federal Courts § 50 at 190 (2d ed. 1970).

In *Green v. County School Bd. of New Kent Co.*, 391 U. S. 430 (1968), the Supreme Court declared that a school board

must take effective action to establish a unitary, nonracial system, if it is not already operating such a system. The Court neither prohibited nor prescribed specific types of plans, but, rather, emphasized that it would judge each plan by its ultimate effectiveness in achieving desegregation. In *Green* itself, the Court held a freedom-of-choice plan insufficient because the plan left the school system segregated, but stated that, under the cirumstances existing in New Kent County, it appeared that the school board could achieve a unitary system either by simple geographical zoning or by consolidating the two schools involved in the case. 391 U. S. at 442, n. 6. Under *Green* and subsequent decisions, it is clear that school boards must implement plans that work to achieve unitary systems. *Northcross v. Bd. of Ed. of the Memphis City Schools*, ... U. S. ....., 38 L.W. 4219 (1970); *Alexander v. Holmes Co. Bd. of Ed.*, 396 U. S. 19 (1969). Plans that do not produce a unitary system are unacceptable.[4]

We think the enunciation of policy by the legislature of the State of North Carolina is entitled to great respect. Federalism requires that whenever it is possible to achieve a unitary system within a framework of neighborhood schools, a federal court ought not to require other remedies in derogation of state policy. But if in a given fact context the state's expressed preference for the neighborhood school cannot be honored without preventing a unitary system, it is the former policy which must yield under the Supremacy Clause.

Stated differently, a statute favoring the neighborhood school concept, freedom-of-choice plans, or both can validly

---

4. The reach of the Court's mandate is not yet clear:

> [A]s soon as possible . . . we ought to resolve some of the basic practical problems when they are appropriately presented including whether, as a constitutional matter, any particular racial balance must be achieved in the schools; to what extent school districts and zones may or must be altered as a constitutional matter; to what extent transportation may or must be provided to achieve the ends sought by prior holdings of the Court.

limit a school board's choice of remedy only if the policy favored will not prevent the operation of a unitary system. That it may or may not depends upon the facts in a particular school system. The flaw in this legislation is its rigidity. As an expression of state policy, it is valid. To the extent that it may interfere with the board's performance of its affirmative constitutional duty to establish a unitary system, it is invalid.

The North Carolina statute, analyzed in light of these principles, is unconstitutional in part. The first paragraph of the statute reads:

> No person shall be refused admission into or be excluded from any public school in this State on account of race, creed, color or national origin. No school attendance district or zone shall be drawn for the purpose of segregating persons of various races, creeds, or national origins from the community.

Northcross v. Bd. of Ed. of the Memphis City Schools, ... U. S. ....., 38 L.W. at 4220 (1970) (Chief Justice Burger, concurring). For our purposes, it is sufficient to say that the mandate applies to require "reasonable" or "justifiable" solutions. *See generally* Fiss, *Racial Imbalance in the Public Schools: The Constitutional Concepts*, 78 Harv. L. Rev. 564 (1965).

There is nothing unconstitutional in this paragraph. It is merely a restatement of the principle announced in *Brown v. Bd. of Ed. of Topeka*, 347 U. S. 483 (1954) *(Brown I)*.

The third paragraph of the statute reads:

> The provisions of this article shall not apply to a temporary assignment due to the unsuitability of a school for its intended purpose nor to any assignment or transfer necessitated by overcrowded conditions or other circumstances which, in the sole discretion of the school board, require assignment or reassignment.

This paragraph merely allows the school board noninvidious discretion to assign students to schools for valid administrative reasons. As we read it, it does not relate to race at all and, so read, is constitutional.

The fourth paragraph provides:

> The provisions of this article shall not apply to an application for the assignment or reassignment by the parent, guardian or person standing in loco parentis of any pupil or to any assignment made pursuant to a choice made by any pupil who is eligible to make such choice pursuant to the provisions of a freedom of choice plan voluntarily adopted by the board of education of an administrative unit.

This paragraph relieves school boards from compliance with the statute where they are implementing voluntarily adopted freedom-of-choice plans within their systems. It does not require the boards to adopt freedom of choice in any particular situation, but leaves them free to comply with their constitutional duty by any effective means available, including, where it is appropriate, freedom of choice. So interpreted, the paragraph is constitutional.

The second paragraph of the statute contains the constitutional infirmity. It reads:

> Where administrative units have divided the geographic area into attendance districts or zones, pupils shall be assigned to schools within such attendance districts; provided, however, that the board of education of an administrative unit may assign any pupil to a school outside of such attendance district or zone in order that such pupil may attend a school of a specialized kind including but not limited to a vocational school or school operated for, or operating programs for, pupils mentally or physically handicapped, or for any other reason which the board of education in its sole discretion deems sufficient. No student shall be assigned or compelled to

> attend any school on account of race, creed, color or national origin, or for the purpose of creating a balance or ratio of race, religion or national origins. Involuntary bussing of students in contravention of this article is prohibited, and public funds shall not be used for any such bussing.

The first sentence of the paragraph presents no greater constitutional problem than the third and fourth paragraphs of the statute, discussed above. It allows school boards to establish a geographically zoned neighborhood school system, but it does not require them to do so. Consequently, this sentence does not prevent the boards from complying with their constitutional duty in circumstances where zoning and neighborhood school plans may not result in a unitary system. The clause in the first sentence permitting assignment for "any other reason" in the board's "sole discretion" we read as meaning simply that the school boards may assign outside the neighborhood school zone for noninvidious administrative reasons. So read, it presents no difficulty. The second and third sentences are unconstitutional. They plainly prohibit school boards from assigning, compelling, or involuntarily bussing students on account of race, or in order to racially "balance" the school system. *Green v. School Bd. of New Kent Co.*, 391 U. S. 430 (1968), *Brown v. Bd. of Ed. of Topeka*, 349 U. S. 294 (1955) (*Brown II*), and *Brown v. Bd. of Ed of Topeka*, 347 U. S. 483 (1954) (*Brown I*), require school boards to consider race for the purpose of disestablishing dual systems.

The Constitution is not color-blind with respect to the affirmative duty to establish and operate a unitary school system. To say that it is would make the constitutional principle of *Brown* I and II an abstract principle instead of an operative one. A flat prohibition against assignment by race would, as a practical matter, prevent school boards from altering existing dual systems. Consequently, the statute clearly contravenes the Supreme Court's direction that boards must take steps adequate to abolish dual systems. See *Green v.*

School Bd. of New Kent Co., 391 U. S. 430, 437 (1968). As far as the prohibition against racial "balance" is concerned, a school board, in taking affirmative steps to desegregate its system, must always engage in some degree of balancing. The degree of racial "balance" necessary to establish a unitary system under given circumstances is not yet clear, see *Northcross v. Bd. of Ed. of the Memphis City Schools*, ... U. S. ....., 38 L.W. at 4220 (1970) (Chief Justice Burger concurring), but because any method of school desegregation involves selection of zones and transfer and assignment of pupils by race, a flat prohibition against racial "balance" violates the equal protection clause of the Fourteenth Amendment. Finally, the statute's prohibition against "involuntary bussing" also violates the equal protection clause. Bussing may not be necessary to eliminate a dual system and establish a unitary one in a given case, but we think the Legislature went too far when it undertook to prohibit its use in all factual contexts. To say that bussing shall not be resorted to unless unavoidable is a valid expression of state policy, but to flatly prohibit it regardless of cost, extent and all other factors—including willingness of a school board to experiment —contravenes, we think, the implicit mandate of *Green* that all reasonable methods be available to implement a unitary system.

Although we hold these statutory prohibitions unconstitutional as violative of equal protection, it does not follow that "bussing" will be an appropriate remedy in any particular school desegregation case. On this issue we express no opinion, for the question is now on appeal to the United States Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit and is not for us to decide.

It is clear that each case must be analyzed on its own facts. See *Green v. School Bd. of New Kent Co.*, 391 U. S. 430 (1968). The legitimacy of the solutions proposed and ordered in each case must be judged against the facts of a particular school system. We merely hold today that North Carolina may not validly enact laws that prevent the utilization of any

reasonable method otherwise available to establish unitary school systems. Its effort to do so is struck down by the equal protection clause of the Fourteenth Amendment and the Supremacy Clause (Article VI, clause 2 of the Constitution).

V.

As we have no cause to doubt the sincerity of the various defendants, the plaintiffs' motion to hold them in contempt for interference with the district court's orders and their request for an injunction against enforcement of the statute will be denied. We believe the defendants, including the state court plaintiffs, will, pending appeal, respect this court's judgment, which applies statewide with respect to the constitutionality of the statute.

Several of the parties have moved to be dismissed from the case, alleging various grounds in support of their motions. Because of the view we take of this suit and the limited relief we grant, the motions to dismiss become immaterial. The school board is undeniably a proper party before the court on the constitutional issue, since it is a party to the desegregation suit. We can, therefore, consider and adjudge the validity of the statute, regardless of the position of the other parties. That we consider the substantive arguments of all the parties in no way harms those who have moved to be dismissed.

An appropriate judgment will be entered in accordance with this opinion.

IN THE DISTRICT COURT OF THE UNITED STATES
FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF NORTH CAROLINA
Charlotte Division
Civil Action No. 1974

JAMES E. SWANN, et al, Plaintiffs,

v

CHARLOTTE-MECKLENBURG BOARD OF EDUCATION, a public body corporate; WILLIAM E. POE; HENDERSON BELK; DAN HOOD; BEN F. HUNTLEY; BETSEY KELLY; COLEMAN W. KERRY, JR.; JULIA MAULDEN; SAM McNINCH, III; CARLTON G. WATKINS; THE NORTH CAROLINA STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION, a public body corporate; and DR. A. CRAIG PHILLIPS, Superintendent of Public Instruction of the State of North Carolina,

Defendants,

and

HONORABLE ROBERT W. SCOTT, Governor of the State of North Carolina; HONORABLE A. C. DAVIS, Controller of the State Department of Public Instruction; HONORABLE WILLIAM K. McLEAN, Judge of the Superior Court of Mecklenburg County; TOM B. HARRIS; G. DON ROBERSON; A. BREECE BRELAND; JAMES M. POSTELL; WILLIAM E. RORIE, JR.; CHALMERS R. CARR; ROBERT T. WILSON; and the CONCERNED PARENTS ASSOCIATION, an unincorporated association in Mecklenburg County; JAMES CARSON and WILLIAM H. BOOE,

Additional Parties Defendant

DESIGNATION OF THREE-JUDGE COURT

It appearing to the undersigned Chief Judge of the Fourth Judicial Circuit of the United States that a civil action as above-entitled has been instituted in the United States District Court for the Western District of North Carolina, and that a motion and application for restraining order and other relief have been filed in this action which do or may raise the question of the constitutionality of Section 115-176.1 of the General Statutes of North Carolina, commonly spoken of as the "anti-bussing" statute and which application and motion also raise other questions; and that application for relief as set out in the pending motion and order was made to James B. McMillan, United States District Judge for the Western District of North Carolina, who has notified the undersigned, pursuant to Section 2284 of Title 28, United States Code, of the pendency of such application to the end that a court of three judges may be constituted in accordance with Section 2281, Title 28, United States Code.

Now, therefore, I do hereby designate Honorable J. Braxton Craven, Jr., United States Circuit Judge, Fourth Judicial Circuit, and Honorable John D. Butzner, Jr., United States Circuit Judge, Fourth Judicial Circuit, to serve with the Honorable James B. McMillan in the hearing and determination of the above-entitled action, as provided by law, the three to constitute a district court of three judges as provided by Section 2284, Title 28, United States Code.

This the 23rd day of February, 1970.

Clement F. Haynsworth, Jr.
Chief Judge - Fourth Circuit

IN THE DISTRICT COURT OF THE UNITED STATES
FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF NORTH CAROLINA
Charlotte Division
Civil Action No. 1974

JAMES E. SWANN, et al, Plaintiffs,

v

CHARLOTTE-MECKLENBURG BOARD OF EDUCATION, a public body corporate; WILLIAM E. POE; HENDERSON BELK; DAN HOOD; BEN F. HUNTLEY; BETSEY KELLY; COLEMAN W. KERRY, JR.; JULIA MAULDEN; SAM McNINCH, III; CARLTON G. WATKINS; THE NORTH CAROLINA STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION, a public body corporate; and DR. A. CRAIG PHILLIPS, Superintendent of Public Instruction of the State of North Carolina,

Defendants,

and

HONORABLE ROBERT W. SCOTT, Governor of the State of North Carolina; HONORABLE A. C. DAVIS, Controller of the State Department of Public Instruction; HONORABLE WILLIAM K. McLEAN, Judge of the Superior Court of Mecklenburg County; TOM B. HARRIS; G. DON ROBERSON; A. BREECE BRELAND; JAMES M. POSTELL; WILLIAM E. RORIE, JR.; CHALMERS R. CARR; ROBERT T. WILSON; and the CONCERNED PARENTS ASSOCIATION, an unincorporated association in Mecklenburg County; JAMES CARSON and WILLIAM H. BOOE,

Additional Parties Defendant

NOTIFICATION AND REQUEST FOR DESIGNATION OF THREE-JUDGE COURT

Several orders, starting April 23, 1969, have been entered by this court dealing with pending motions for desegregation of the Charlotte-Mecklenburg schools. The orders of December 1 and December 2, 1969, and February 5, 1970, are attached as Exhibits A, B and C to this motion.

The December 2, 1969, order appointed Dr. John A. Finger, Jr. to assist the court in the preparation of a plan for the desegregation of the schools. The February 5, 1970, order directs the schools to be desegregated according to various principles described or referred to in the order, including the requirement erroneously advertised as "involuntary bussing to achieve racial balance" which reads as follows:

> "That transportation be offered on a uniform nonracail basis to all children whose attendance in any school is necessary to bring about the reduction of segregation, and who live farther from the school to which they are assigned than the Board determines to be walking distance."

A suit has been filed in the General Court of Justice, Superior Court Division, Mecklenburg County, North Carolina, No. 70-CVS-1097, entitled "TOM B. HARRIS, G. DON ROBERSON, et al, Plaintiffs, vs. WILLIAM C. SELF, Superintendent of Charlotte-Mecklenburg Schools, and CHARLOTTE BOARD OF EDUCATION, Defendants," and pursuant to allegations made in that action, Judge W. K. McLean, of the Superior Court of North Carolina, has entered an order temporarily restraining the School Board and the Superintendent from paying Dr. Finger's bills until they have been approved by the Board of Education, and ordering that "the defendant Charlotte-Mecklenburg Board of Education and its agents, servants and employees be and they hereby are enjoined and restrained from expending any money from tax or other public funds for the purpose of purchasing or renting any motor vehicles, or operating or maintaining such, for the purpose of involuntarily transporting students in the

Charlotte-Mecklenburg School System from one school to another and from one district to another district."

The complaint, the amended complaint and the two orders of Judge McLean dated February 12, 1970, are attached hereto as Exhibit D.

The Governor of North Carolina has made a public statement, Exhibit E, and has written a letter to the Department of Administration, Exhibit F.

The State Superintendent of Public Instruction, a party to this case, has made a public statement, Exhibit G.

Reports received from the School Board on February 12, 1970, and February 19, 1970, fail to mention Judge McLean's order, and fail to indicate that the Board have appealed or intend to appeal Judge McLean's order; and these reports also reveal no action by the Board or school staff addressed to the transportation problem. It appears that whether the action of Judge McLean and the other state officials do or do not directly conflict with this court's orders, the practical effect of those actions is or may be to delay or defeat compliance with the orders of this United States Court.

The plaintiffs have filed a motion to make additional parties, and have requested this court to enter orders dissolving Judge McLean's restraining orders and directing the Governor, the State Department of Instruction and the "Concerned Parents Association" and their attorneys and others not to interfere further with the compliance of the school Board with the orders of this court.

Some of the issues raised by this situation may involve the constitutionality of a state statute and others may be matters cognizable by a single judge.

It appearing to the court that pursuant to Title 28, U.S.C.A., this matter should be heard and determined by a district court of three judges.

NOW, THEREFORE, it is respectfully requested that the Chief Judge of the United States Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit designate two other judges, at least one of whom shall be a circuit judge, to serve with the undersigned district judge as members of the court to hear and determine the action.

This the 19th day of February, 1970.

James B. McMillan
United States District Judge

IN THE
UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE
WESTERN DISTRICT OF NORTH CAROLINA
CHARLOTTE DIVISION

JAMES E. SWANN, et al, Plaintiffs	)	
v	)	
CHARLOTTE-MECKLENBURG BOARD OF EDUCATION, a public body corporate; WILLIAM E. POE; HENDERSON BELK; DAN HOOD; BEN F. HUNTLEY; BETSEY KELLY; COLEMAN W. KERRY, JR.; JULIA MAULDEN; SAM McNINCH, III; CARLTON G. WATKINS; THE NORTH CAROLINA STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION, a public body corporate; and DR. A. CRAIG PHILLIPS, SUPERINTENDENT OF PUBLIC INSTRUCTION OF THE STATE OF NORTH CAROLINA, Defendants	)	CIVIL ACTION NO. 1974

SUPPLEMENTAL COMPLAINT

I.

This Supplemental Complaint is a proceeding for a temporary restraining order and a preliminary and permanent injunction against the enforcement of the portions of North Carolina General Statutes §115-176.1, (Chapter 1274 of the Session Laws of the 1969 General Assembly of North Carolina, ratified on July 2, 1969, a copy of which is attached hereto as Exhibit A) which reads:

> "No student shall be assigned or compelled to attend any school on account of race, creed, color or national origin, or for the purpose of creating a balance or ratio of race,

religion or national origin. Involuntary bussing of students in contravention of this Article is prohibited, and public funds shall not be used for any such bussing."

In addition, plaintiffs seek a declaratory judgment that the statutory provisions complained of are unconstitutional on their face and as applied.

II.

A. Jurisdiction of this Court is invoked under 28 USC § 1343, this being a suit in equity authorized by 42 USC § 1983 to redress the deprivation, under color of North Carolina Law, of rights, privileges and immunities guaranteed by the Thirteenth and Fourteenth Amendments to the Constitution of the United States.

B. Jurisdiction is further invoked under 28 USC § § 2281 and 2284, this being a suit for a temporary restraining order, an interlocutory and permanent injunction restraining the enforcement, operation and execution of portions of North Carolina General Statutes § 115-176.1 and requiring the convening of a three-judge Federal Court. Jurisdiction is further invoked under 28 USC § § 2201 and 2202, this being a suit for a declaratory judgment declaring the unconstitutionality of portions of North Carolina General Statutes 115-176.1.

III.

A. The plaintiffs bringing this Supplemental Complaint are those plaintiffs who originally brought this action styled James E. Swann, et al., v. Charlotte-Mecklenburg Board of Education, Civil Action No. 1974, which was filed on January 12, 1965.

B. This Supplemental Complaint, as the original complaint, is brought on behalf of the individual plaintiffs and other black students and parents similarly situated, pursuant to Rule 23 (a) and (b) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. There are common questions of law and fact affecting the rights of such other black students, who are and have been limited, classi-

fied, segregated or otherwise discriminated against in ways which deprive or tend to deprive them of equal educational opportunities because of race or color. The members of the class are so numerous as to make it impractical to bring them all before the Court. A common relief is sought and plaintiffs adequately represent the interests of the class.

IV.

The defendants in this action are:

(a) The Charlotte-Mecklenburg Board of Education, the original defendant in this case, and the individual members thereof heretofore added as defendants by order of the Court dated June 4, 1969;

(b) The North Carolina State Board of Education, a public body corporate of the State of North Carolina, which is charged by the State Constitution and laws with the duty and responsibility of the general supervision and administration of the public schools and educational funds of the State of North Carolina; and

(c) Dr. A. Craig Phillips, who is the elected State Superintendent of Public Instruction of the State of North Carolina, the administrative head of the Public School System of the State and by force of law, a member and the Secretary of the State Board of Education.

V.

Plaintiffs initially commenced this action on January 12, 1965, (Civil Action No. 1974) against the Charlotte-Mecklenburg Board of Education seeking to obtain the elimination of racial segregation in the public schools in Mecklenburg County.

VI.

On July 14, 1969, the Court entered an Order approving a plan submitted by the Board for the desegregation of the schools. The plaintiffs appealed and the decision was affirmed by the United States Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit.

(Swann v Charlotte-Mecklenburg Board of Education, 369 F 2d ..... (Fourth Circuit 1966.).)

VII.

A. On September 6, 1968, the plaintiffs moved the Court for further relief contending that the Board was required to take further steps to disestablish the dual school system in Mecklenburg County.

B. On April 23, 1969, the Court, following several days of testimony heard in March, 1969, entered an Opinion and Order Regarding the Desegregation of the Schools of Charlotte and Mecklenburg County. The Court found that the schools remained segregated, that the pupil assignment system and the placement of the schools continued to racially segregate the pupils, that the faculties had not been adequately desegregated as previously directed by the Court in 1965 and that the Board was to submit a plan for the desegregation of the schools by May 15, 1969.

C. The Order directed the defendants to submit a plan for the active and complete desegregation of the teachers within the system to be effective in the 1969-70 school year and that the plan should seek to apportion teachers to each school in substantially the same ratio (3 to 1) as the ratio of white teachers and black teachers in the system at large.

D. The defendants were also directed to submit a plan and timetable for the active and complete desegregation of the pupils within the system to be predominantly effective in the fall of 1969, and to be completed by the fall of 1970.

E. The Board was directed to consider several methods of desegregation which had been advanced by the plaintiffs, including pairing of grades and schools; feeding elementary schools into junior and senior high schools; combining zones and free choice where each method proceeds logically towards eliminating segregation; bussing and other transportation; setting up large consolidated school units freely crossing city

and county lines to serve larger areas; and to seek aid as may be available from State and Federal agencies.

F. The Court thereafter upon request of defendant, granted an extension of time until May 29, 1969, within which to file its plan.

VIII.

A. On May 15, 1969, the plaintiffs filed a motion for a temporary restraining order seeking to restrain all school construction pending approval by the Court of a school construction plan designed to promote desegregation of the schools.

B. The Board filed its plan on May 28, 1969, as required by the Order of the Court.

C. On June 4, 1969, the Court entered orders setting a date for hearing on the adequacy of the defendant's plan and set forth certain questions to which the parties were to respond at the hearing. In addition, the Court ordered that all members of the Board of Education be added as parties defendant.

D. On June 11, 1969, the plaintiffs filed objections to the plan submitted by the defendant and moved for civil contempt.

E. On June 11, 1969, the defendants moved to set aside the Order of the Court adding the individual Board members as defendants. On June 12, 1969, a similar motion was filed on behalf of the defendant, William E. Poe. The plaintiffs filed a response in opposition to these motions.

F. A hearing was held on the adequacy of the plan and on all pending motions on June 16, 17, and 18, 1969.

IX.

A. The Court entered an Opinion and Order dated June 20, 1969, which was supplemented by additional findings on June 24, 1969.

B. The Court denied the motions of the individual Board members to dismiss and denied plaintiffs' motion for contempt.

C. The Court found that a desegregation plan had been submitted to the Board by the Superintendent, but that the Board struck out virtually all the effective provisions of the plan; that the plan filed as to pupils and teachers was nearly identical to the one previously found racially discriminatory; that the attendance areas of several of the schools were racially gerrymandered; that the defendants had not met their burden to show that the school construction plan would promote the desegregation of the schools.

D. The Court found that desegregation of schools is something that has to be accomplished independent of freedom of transfer.

E. The Court ordered the defendants to prepare and submit by August 4, 1969, a positive plan for the desegregation of the Charlotte-Mecklenburg School System as originally directed on April 23, 1969.

X.

A. The April 23, 1969, Order of the Court contained the following findings by the Court:

> *"The 'Neighborhood School' Theory . . .*
>
> . . .
>
> The neighborhood school concept may well be invalid for school administrative purposes even without regard for racial problems. The Charlotte-Mecklenburg School Board, today, for example, is transporting 23,000 students on school busses. First graders may be the largest group so transported. If a first grader lives far enough from school to ride a bus, the school is not part of his neighborhood.
>
> When racial segregation was required by law, nobody evoked the neighborhood school theory to *permit* black children to attend white schools close to where they lived. The values of the theory somehow were repudiated by the 1955 North Carolina General Assembly and still stands repudiated in the Pupil Assignment Act of 1955-56, which

is quoted above. The neighborhood school theory has no standing to override the Constitution.

Busing. Under North Carolina General Statutes, § § 115-180, the Board is expressly authorized to operate school busses to transport school children; the state pays bus expenses only for rural children and for some who have been annexed into the city in recent years. This apparent discrimination against city dwellers is reportedly under attack in another court. This Board already transports 23,000 students to school every day out of the 32,000 who live in the area presently eligible for bus service. The present cost of school bussing is about $19 for bus operation plus the cost of the bus which is $4,500 per bus should not exceed $20 per pupil a year. In other words, it costs about $40 a year per pupil to provide school bus transportation, out of total per pupil school operating costs of about $540. The income of many black families is so low they are not able to pay for the cost of transportation out of segregated schools to other schools of their choice.

The Board has the power to use school busses for all legitimate school purposes. Busses for many years were used to operate segregated schools. There is no reason except emotion (and I confess to having felt my own share of emotion on this subject in all the years before I studied the facts) why school busses can not be used by the Board to provide the flexibility and economy necessary to desegregate the schools. Busses are cheaper than new buildings; using them might even keep property taxes down."

B. The Court found that 95% of the blacks were concentrated in the western portion of the City of Charlotte and that official action taken on schools, zoning and planning had contributed to this concentration.

XI.

A. On May 7, 1969, a member of the Mecklenburg County House delegation of the North Carolina General Assembly in-

troduced a bill (House Bill 990, a copy of which is attached hereto as Exhibit B) entitled "AN ACT TO PROTECT THE NEIGHBORHOOD SCHOOL SYSTEM AND TO PROTECT THE INVOLUNTARY BUSSING OF PUPILS OUTSIDE THE DISTRICT IN WHICH THEY RESIDE." The Bill, as subsequently amended, was ratified on July 2, 1969 (See Exhibit A), and is now codified as North Carolina General Statutes §115-176.1.

B. The ratified bill, which has the same title as the bill introduced on May 7, 1969, provides:

1. Students cannot be excluded from any school on account of race.

2. Students shall be assigned to the school within the geographical district where the pupil resides, except for children attending special schools or except for any reason the local board deems sufficient.

3. "*No student shall be assigned or compelled to attend any school on account of race, creed, color or national origin, or for the purpose of creating a balance or ratio of race, religion or national origins. Involuntary bussing of students in contravention of this article is prohibited, and public funds shall not be used for any such bussing.*"

4. The article does not apply in temporary situations of unsuitability of schools or over-crowding.

5. Nor does it apply to "any assignment made pursuant to a choice made by any pupil . . . pursuant to . . . a freedom of choice plan voluntarily adopted by the Board."

XII.

The defendants State Board of Education and State Superintendent of Public Instruction are responsible to insure that the prohibitions against involuntary student assignments and bussing contained in North Carolina General Statutes §115-176.1 are complied with in the Charlotte-Mecklenburg School

System and other administrative units throughout the State and that public funds over which they have control not be used for any such bussing.

XIII.

Involuntary bussing and pupil assignments which are prohibited by North Carolina General Statutes §115-176.1 are necessary devices to carry out the existing orders of this and other Federal Courts in North Carolina and to comply with the duties imposed by the Constitution upon defendants herein and other school officials in North Carolina. The purpose, motive and effect of provisions of North Carolina General Statutes §115-176.1 complained of herein, is to forbid these defendants and other school officials in North Carolina from complying with existing lawful orders of this and other Federal Courts and to forbid them from complying with the requirements of the Thirteenth and Fourteenth Amendments to the Constitution in the State of North Carolina. The provisions thus violate the constitutional rights of plaintiffs and others similarly situated.

XIV.

Plaintiffs and those similarly situated and affected, on whose behalf this action is brought are suffering irreparable injury and will suffer irreparable injury in the future by reason of the provisions of the Statute complained of herein. They have no plain, adequate or complete remedy to redress the wrongs complained of herein other than this action for a declaratory judgment and injunction. Any other remedy to which plaintiffs could be remitted would be attended by such uncertainties and delays as to deny substantial relief, would involve a multiplicity of suits and would cause further irreparable injury.

WHEREFORE, plaintiffs respectfully pray that, upon the filing of this Supplemental Complaint, the Court:

1. Issue a temporary restraining order restraining the defendants, their agents and other persons acting in concert with them from giving consideration or effect to and from enforcing,

administering, or applying the provisions contained in North Carolina General Statutes §115-176.1 complained of herein;

2. Convene a three-judge District Court as required by 28 USC § §2281 and 2284;

3. Advance this cause on the docket and order a speedy hearing of this action according to law and upon such hearing:

a. Enter judgment declaring the statutory provisions complained of herein void as repugnant to the Thirteenth and Fourteenth Amendments to the Constitution of the United States;

b. Enter a preliminary and permanent injunction restraining all defendants, their agents and other persons acting in concert with them from giving consideration or effect to and from enforcing, administering, or applying the complained provisions of North Carolina General Statutes §115-176.1;

c. Allow plaintiffs their costs herein, reasonable attorneys fees and such other and further relief as to the Court may appear equitable and just.

Respectfully submitted,

Adam Stein

CONRAD O. PEARSON
203 1/2 East Chapel Hill Street
Durham, North Carolina

CHAMBERS, STEIN, FERGUSON & LANNING
216 West Tenth Street
Charlotte, North Carolina

JACK GREENBERG
JAMES M. NABRIT, III
NORMAN CHACHKIN
10 Columbus Circle
New York, New York 10019

Attorneys for Plaintiffs

THE NORTH CAROLINA GENERAL ASSEMBLY
1969 SESSION

RATIFIED BILL
CHAPTER 1274
HOUSE BILL 990

AN ACT TO PROTECT THE NEIGHBORHOOD SCHOOL SYSTEM AND TO PROHIBIT THE INVOLUNTARY BUSSING OF PUPILS OUTSIDE THE DISTRICT IN WHICH THEY RESIDE. The General Assembly of North Carolina do enact:

Section 1. There is hereby created a new section of Chapter 115 of the General Statutes to be codified as GS 115-176.1 and to read as follows:

"§ 115-176.1. *Assignment of pupils based on race, creed, color or national origin prohibited.* No person shall be refused admission into or be excluded from any public school in this State on account of race, creed, color or national origin. No school attendance district or zone shall be drawn for the purpose of segregating persons of various races, creeds, colors or national origins from the community.

Where administrative units have divided the geographic area into attendance districts or zones, pupils shall be assigned to schools within such attendance districts; provided, however, that the board of education of an administrative unit may assign any pupil to a school outside of such attendance district or zone in order that such pupil may attend a school of a specialized kind including but not limited to a vocational school or school operated for, or operating programs for, pupils mentally or physically handicapped, or for any other reason which the board of education in its sole discretion deems sufficient. No student shall be assigned or compelled to attend any school on account of race, creed, color or national origin, or for the purpose of creating a balance or ratio of race, religion or national origins. Involuntary bussing of students in contravention of

this Article is prohibited, and public funds shall not be used for any such bussing.

The provisions of this Article shall not apply to a temporary assignment due to the unsuitability of a school for its intended conditions or other circumstances which, in the sole discretion of the School Board, require assignment or reassignment.

The provisions of this Article shall not apply to an application for the assignment or re-assignment by the parent, guardian or person standing in loco parentis of any pupil or to any assignment made pursuant to a choice made by any pupil who is eligible to make such choice pusuant to the provisions of a freedom of choice plan voluntarily adopted by the board of education of an administrative unit."

Sec. 2. All laws and clauses of laws in conflict with this Act are hereby repealed.

Sec. 3. If part of the Act is held to be in violation of the Constitution of the United States or North Carolina, such part shall be severed and the remainder shall remain in full force and effect.

Sec. 4. This Act shall be in full force and effect upon its ratification.

In the General Assembly read three times and ratified, this the 2nd day of July, 1969.

H. P. TAYLOR, JR.

H. P. Taylor, Jr.
President of the Senate.

Philip P. Godwin

Philip P. Godwin
Speaker of the House of Representatives

NORTH CAROLINA GENERAL ASSEMBLY
1969 SESSION
HOUSE BILL 990

(Public)

Sponsors: Representatives Carson, J. Johnson, and Hege.
Referred to: Education

May 7

A BILL TO BE ENTITLED AN ACT TO PROTECT THE NEIGHBORHOOD SCHOOL SYSTEM AND TO PROHIBIT THE INVOLUNTARY BUSSING OF PUPILS OUTSIDE THE DISTRICT IN WHICH THEY RESIDE.

The General Assembly of North Carolina do enact:

Section 1. There is hereby created a new Section of Chapter 115 of the General Statutes to be codified as GS 115-183.1 and to read as follows:

"*GS 115-183.1. Pupil assignment within neighborhood; involuntary bussing prohibited.* Notwithstanding any provisions of this or other Chapters, no pupil shall be assigned to a school outside the district in which he resides except upon the application of his parent, guardian, or person standing in loco parentis as hereinbefore provided.

Pupils residing within a district where two or more schools are located shall be assigned to the school which is closest to their place of residence unless application to attend elsewhere is made by the parent, guardian, or person standing in loco parentis. Applications for assignments outside the pupils' school district or to a school further from the pupils' residence than another school within the district shall be determined by the city or county board as hereinbefore set forth.

The city or county board may, in its discretion and subject to provisions as hereinbefore set forth, provide transportation for pupils assigned either within or without the district. Provided, however, students shall not be bussed or transported out-

side their respective districts or to a school more distant from their residences than another school within the district except in cases where the parent, guardian, or person standing in loco parentis has requested such assignment as hereinbefore set forth. Public funds, whether from taxation or any other source, shall not be used to provide transportation for pupils assigned in contravention of this Article."

Sec. 2. All laws and clauses of laws in conflict with this Act are hereby repealed.

Sec. 3. If part of the Act is held to be in violation of the Constitution of the United States or North Carolina, such part shall be severed and the remainder shall remain in full force and effect.

Sec. 4. This Act shall be in full force and effect upon its ratification.

IN THE
UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE
WESTERN DISTRICT OF NORTH CAROLINA
CHARLOTTE DIVISION

JAMES E. SWANN, et al., Plaintiffs,	)	
v.	)	CIVIL ACTION
THE CHARLOTTE-MECKLENBURG BOARD OF EDUCATION, et al., Defendants	)	NO. 1974

ORDER

Upon motion by plaintiffs for leave to file a supplemental complaint and add The North Carolina State Board of Education and Dr. A. Craig Phillips, Superintendent of Public Instruction for the State of North Carolina as defendants and it appearing to the Court that good cause is shown therefor

It is ORDERED that plaintiffs' motion for leave to file a supplemental complaint and to add The North Carolina State Board of Education and Dr. A. Craig Phillips, Superintendent of Public Instruction of the State of North Carolina as defendants is granted.

The United States Marshal is directed to serve the supplemental complaint and summons upon the above named defendants.

This 22 day of July, 1969.

James T. McMillan
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

IN THE DISTRICT COURT OF THE UNITED STATES
FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF NORTH CAROLINA
CHARLOTTE DIVISION

JAMES E. SWANN, et al., Plaintiffs, v. CHARLOTTE-MECKLENBURG BOARD OF EDUCATION, a public body corporate; WILLIAM E. POE; HENDERSON BELK; DAN HOOD; BEN F. HUNTLEY; BETSEY KELLY; COLEMAN W. KERRY, JR.; JULIA MAULDEN; SAM McNINCH, III; CARLTON G. WATKINS; THE NORTH CAROLINA STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION, a public body corporate; and DR. A. CRAIG PHILLLIPS, Superintendent of Public Instruction of the State of North Carolina, Defendants.	)	CIVIL ACTION NO. 1974

MOTION FOR LEAVE TO FILE SUPPLEMENTAL COMPLAINT, TO ADD ADDITIONAL DEFENDANTS AND FOR TEMPORARY RESTRAINING ORDER

Plaintiffs, by their undersigned counsel, respectfully move the Court for leave to file a Suplemental Complaint and for a temporary restraining order restraining the defendants from giving consideration or effect to and from enforcing, administering, or applying certain provisions of North Carolina General Statutes §115-176.1 and as grounds therefor show the following:

1. Plaintiffs seek, by this motion, leave to file a Supplemental Complaint, copies of which are being forwarded this day to the Court together with summonses for service upon the

North Carolina State Board of Education and Dr. A. Craig Phillips, Superintendent of Public Instruction of the State of North Carolina, parties which the plaintiffs seek to add as defendants to this action. Plaintiffs have served copies of the Supplemental Complaint upon counsel for those defendants now parties to this action.

2. The Supplemental Complaint seeks injunctive and declaratory relief against the following prohibitions contained in North Carolina General Statutes §115-176.1[1]

> "No student shall be assigned or compelled to attend any school on account of race, creed, color or national origin, or for the purpose of creating a balance or ratio of race, religion or national origins. Involuntary bussing of students in contravention of this Article is prohibited, and public funds shall not be used for any such bussing."

3. For reasons stated more fully in the Supplemental Complaint, plaintiffs allege that the purpose, motive and effect of the statutory provisions complained of therein is to forbid the defendants, now parties to this action, and other school officials in the State of North Carolina from complying with existing lawful orders of this and other courts and to forbid them from complying with the requirements of the Thirteenth and Fourteenth Amendments to the Constitution of the United States. Plaintiffs allege that this is so because compulsory assignments and involuntary bussing, prohibited by North Carolina General Statutes §115-176.1, are necessary devices for complying with the orders of this Court entered on April 23, 1969, and June 20, 1969, and for complying with constitutional requirements.

4. Plaintiffs seek to add as parties-defendant, the North

---

1. North Carolina General Statutes §115-176.1 was enacted as Chapter 1274 of the Session Laws of the 1969 North Carolina General Assembly which was ratified on July 2, 1969. A copy of the Ratified Bill is attached to the Supplemental Complaint as Exhibit A.

Carolina State Board of Education and Dr. A. Craig Phillips, the Superintendent of Public Instruction. These parties are charged by the constitution and laws of the State of North Carolina with the general supervision and administration of the public schools and the disbursement of public funds to the various public schools in North Carolina. They are thus required by North Carolina law to insure that public funds are not spent for involuntary bussing and pupil assignments. They are therefore proper and necessary parties to an adjudication of the constitutional issues raised by the plaintiffs in the Supplemental Complaint. In addition, they are proper parties to this proceeding because, they, together with local school officials have an affirmative duty to take active steps to disestablish the dual school system in Charlotte-Mecklenburg County and other administrative units throughout the State.

5. Plaintiffs, in their Supplemental Complaint, request that a three-judge Court be constituted to determine their constitutional challenge to a statute of state-wide application. This motion for a temporary restraining order is addressed to the single District Court judge hearing this case pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §2284(3).

6. Plaintiffs allege that, unless immediately restrained, the defendants will apply the statutory provisions complained of herein and will thereby fail to comply with the orders of this Court of April 23 and June 20, 1969, thus causing plaintiffs irreparable damage. In support of this allegation, the plaintiffs attach hereto the affidavit of Reginald A. Hawkins, the next friend of plaintiffs in this action.

WHEREFORE, plaintiffs respectfully pray that they be granted leave to file their Supplemental Complaint, that they be allowed to add the North Carolina State Board of Education and Dr. A. Craig Phillips, Superintendent of Public Instruction of the State of North Carolina as defendants in this action and that all defendants be restrained from enforcing the complained of provisions of North Carolina General Statutes §115-176.1.

Respectfully submitted,
/s/ Adam Stein

CONRAD D. PEARSON
203 1/2 East Chapel Hill Street
Durham, North Carolina

CHAMBERS, STEIN, FERGUSON & LANNING
216 West Tenth Street
Charlotte, North Carolina

JACK GREENBURG
JAMES M. NABRIT, III
NORMAN CHACHKIN
10 Columbus Circle
New York, New York 10019

Attorneys for Plaintiffs

IN THE
UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE
WESTERN DISTRICT OF NORTH CAROLINA
CHARLOTTE DIVISION

JAMES E. SWANN, et al., Plaintiffs,	)	
v.	)	
CHARLOTTE-MECKLENBURG BOARD OF EDUCATION, a public body corporate; WILLIAM E. POE; HENDERSON BELK; DAN HOOD; BEN F. HUNTLEY; BETSEY KELLY; COLEMAN W. KERRY, JR.; JULIA MAULDEN; SAM McNINCH, III; CARLTON G. WATKINS; THE NORTH CAROLINA STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION, a public body corporate; and DR. A. CRAIG PHILLIPS, SUPERINTENDENT OF PUBLIC INSTRUCTION OF THE STATE OF NORTH CAROLINA, Defendants.	)	CIVIL ACTION NO. 1974

ANSWER OF THE DEFENDANTS, THE NORTH CAROLINA STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION AND SUPERINTENDANT OF PUBLIC INSTRUCTION OF THE STATE OF NORTH CAROLINA, TO THE SUPPLEMENTAL COMPLAINT.

(1) Answering the allegations of Paragraph I of the Supplemental Complaint, these answering defendants allege that the order allowing the plaintiffs to file a supplemental complaint is based upon a motion which was filed in the Office of the Clerk of the Federal Court for the Western District on July 22, 1969, and the order of the Judge of the District Court was also filed on the same date, July 22, 1969, and said order allowing said Supplemental Complaint to be filed is void, invalid and

contrary to due process of law for that the North Carolina State Board of Education and the State Superintendent of Public Instruction were never given an opportunity to appear before the Court and resist said Motion, but, to the contrary, the same is an exparte order entered without service upon the said defendants of any notice or copy of said motion prior to the granting of said order; it is admitted that there is quoted in Paragraph I of the Supplemental Complaint a portion of Chapter 1274 of the Session Laws of 1969 of the General Assembly of this State; it is denied that the plaintiffs are entitled to any preliminary and permanent injunction as against these State defendants or that the plaintiffs are entitled to a declaratory judgment as against these defandants.

(2) Answering the allegations of Paragraph II of the plaintiffs' Supplemental Complaint, it is denied that this Court has jurisdiction as against these State defendants under the Federal statutes cited in said paragraph or under the constitutional provisions cited in said paragraph; it is denied that G. S. 115-176.1 is unconstitutional and invalid or that the plaintiffs are entitled to any declaratory judgment or the convening of a 3-judge federal court; the allegations of Paragraph II are, therefore, untrue, and are denied.

(3) The allegations of Paragraph III are untrue and are denied except the allegation as to the status of the plaintiffs being the same plaintiffs who instituted the original action; it is denied that the plaintiffs are entitled to maintain a class action as against these State defendants.

(4) Answering the allegations of Paragraph IV, these State defendants have nothing to do with the defendants named as the Charlotte-Mecklenburg Board of Education and the individual members thereof, and, therefore, are not required to answer the allegations of subparagraph (a) of Paragraph IV of the Complaint; it is alleged, therefore, that the duties of North Carolina State Board of Education and of Dr. A. Craig Phillips are fixed by State statutes, and, therefore, the allegations of subparagraphs (b) and (c) are denied.

(5) The allegations of Paragraph V are admitted.

(6) The allegations of Paragraph VI are admitted.

(7) Answering the allegations of Paragraph VII, these State defendants allege that the same relate to a motion for further relief filed against the Charlotte-Mecklenburg Board of Education, hearings on same, orders to submit plans of desegregation and matters with which these State defendants are not concerned, and these State defendants allege that they are not required to answer said Paragraph VII.

(8) The allegations of Paragraph VIII of the Complaint relate to matters with which these State defendants are not concerned and of which they have no knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of same, and as to these State defendants the allegations of said paragraph are, therefore, denied.

(9) Answering the allegations of Paragraph IX, these State defendants allege that said allegations relate to matters that these defendants are not concerned with and with which these State defendants have not knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief to form the truth of same and as to these defendants said paragraph is, therefore, denied.

(10) Answering the allegations of Paragraph X, the State defendants allege that whatever appears in the orders of the Court previous to the filing of this Supplemental Complaint are matters or record, and, therefore, they are not required to answer as to same.

(11) Answering the allegations of Paragraph XI, these State defendants allege that the General Assembly of North Carolina at its Session of 1969 enacted into law an Act which is now codified as G. S. 115-176.1 and that said Act was ratified on July 2, 1969; that said Act speaks for itself as to its contents, and except as herein admitted the allegations of Paragraph XI are untrue and are denied.

(12) The allegations of Paragraph XII are untrue and are, therefore, denied.

(13) The allegations of Paragraph XIII are untrue and are, therefore, denied.

(14) The allegations of Paragraph XIV are untrue and are, therefore, denied.

WHEREFORE, having fully answered, these State defendants pray the Court that this action as to the State defendants be dismissed, that the plaintiffs take nothing by their action as to these State defendants and that the State defendants have and recover their costs to be taxed by the Clerk of this Court.

Robert Morgan
Attorney General of North Carolina

Ralph Moody
Deputy Attorney General

Andrew A. Vanore, Jr.
Staff Attorney

P. O. Box 629
Justice Building
Raleigh, North Carolina 27602

IN THE
UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE
WESTERN DISTRICT OF NORTH CAROLINA
CHARLOTTE DIVISION

JAMES E. SWANN, et al.,
Plaintiffs,
v.
CHARLOTTE-MECKLENBURG BOARD OF EDUCATION, a public body corporate; WILLIAM E. POE; HENDERSON BELK; DAN HOOD; BEN F. HUNTLEY; BETSEY KELLY; COLEMAN W. KERRY, JR.; JULIA MAULDEN; SAM McNINCH, III; CARLTON G. WATKINS; THE NORTH CAROLINA STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION, a public body corporate; and DR. A. CRAIG PHILLIPS, Superintendent of Public Instruction of the State of North Carolina,
Defendants,
and
HONORABLE ROBERT W. SCOTT, Governor of the State of North Carolina; HONORABLE A. C. DAVIS, Controller of the State Department of Public Instruction; HONORABLE WILLIAM K. McLEAN, Judge of the Superior Court of Mecklenburg County; TOM B. HARRIS; G. DON ROBERSON; A. BREECE BRELAND; JAMES M. POSTELL; WILLIAM E. RORIE, JR.; CHALMERS R. CARR; ROBERT T. WILSON; and the CONCERNED PARENTS ASSOCIATION, an unincorporated association in Mecklenburg County; JAMES CARSON and WILLIAM H. BOOE,
Additional
Parties-Defendant.

CIVIL ACTION NO. 1974

MOTION TO ADD ADDITIONAL PARTIES DEFENDANT AND FOR FURTHER RELIEF

On February 5, 1970, this Court entered an order directing the Charlotte-Mecklenburg Board of Education and the individual members of the Board to proceed immediately to desegregate the public schools of Charlotte-Mecklenburg County. The Court directed that students be assigned to the various schools under plans presented and adopted by the Board and a plan prepared by the Court's consultant, Dr. John A. Finger. The order provided for changing attendance zones of some schools, pairing of some schools, and transportation of students living beyond "walking distance" from the schools to which assigned. The order further directed that the plan be implemented for elementary schools no later than April 1, 1970 and for secondary schools no later than May 4, 1970. The School Board was specifically directed to begin immediately with steps to implement the plan.

Prior to the filing of the order on February 5, 1970, Tom B. Harris, G. Don Roberson, A. Breece Breland, James M. Postell, William E. Rorie, Jr., Chalmers R. Carr, and Robert T. Wilson, on their behalf and on the behalf of the Concerned Parents Association, an unincorporated association, brought a proceeding in the Superior Court of Mecklenburg County, by their attorney, William H. Booe, to obstruct and prevent the School Board from implementing the orders directed by this Court. They obtained from the Superior Court of Mecklenburg County an *ex parte* order specifically enjoining the Superintendent from implementing the order of this Court directing the Board to pay the expenses and fees of the Court consultant.

Following the order of February 5, 1970, Tom B. Harris, G. Don Roberson and others of the Concerned Parents Association have sought and are seeking by various means to obstruct and prevent implementation of the Court's orders. On February 12, 1970, they obtained from the Honorable William K. McLean, Judge Presiding in the Superior Court of Mecklenburg County, an order enjoining the School Board from spending

any funds to purchase and operate school buses as directed by this Court.

The Honorable Robert H. Scott, Governor of the State of North Carolina, on February 11 and 12, 1970, objected to the Court's order and directed that no public funds, state or local, be expended for the purpose of implementing the order. The Honorable Dr. A. Craig Phillips, State Superintendent of Public Instruction, and the North Carolina State Board of Education, defendants herein, joined with the Governor in objecting to the Court's order and in directing that no public funds be used for the purpose of implementing the order.

On February 6, 1970, Honorable James Carson, a member of the Mecklenburg Delegation to the North Carolina House of Representatives, threatened to and is preparing to file similar proceedings in the State Court of North Carolina to obstruct and thwart the enforcement of the Court's orders.

These parties, along with divers others, are seeking to obstruct and prevent implementation of the Court's orders directing compliance by the school authorities with their constitutional obligations.

Despite the Court's directive to the School Board to proceed forthwith with all necessary steps to implement the order, the School Board, the State Superintendent and the State Board of Education have failed to do so. Plaintiffs are advised that no efforts have been made to secure the necessary buses for transporting students as directed by the Court. Plaintiffs are also advised that such buses as may be necessary can be ordered and manufactured by the time directed by the Court for implementation of the plan. The failure of the School Board to act now in securing the necessary facilities for transportation may prevent desegregation of the schools in the time directed.

Plaintiffs are advised, believe and so allege that the activities and conduct of the defendants and each of them are pursuant to a design to thwart, impede and prevent desegregation of the public schools of Charlotte-Mecklenburg County and that the

acts, activities and conduct of the defendants were calculated and intended to incite disobedience of the law and the overthrow of law and order and to coerce, intimidate, and compel school officials from performance of their constitutional responsibilities to desegregate the public schools of this system.

In order to insure full implementation of the Court's order within the time directed, plaintiffs, by their undersigned counsel, respectfully move the Court that the following parties be added as parties-defendant in this proceeding:

Honorable Robert H. Scott, Governor of the State of North Carolina;

Honorable A. C. Davis, Controller of the State Department of Public Instruction;

Honorable William K. McLean, Judge of the Superior Court of Mecklenburg County;

Tom B. Harris, G. Don Roberson, A. Breece Breland, James M. Postell, William E. Rorie, Jr., Chalmers R. Carr, Robert T. Wilson, and the Concerned Parents Association, an unincorporated association in the Mecklenburg County;

James Carson and William H. Booe.

Plaintiffs further pray the Court for a temporary and permanent injunction dissolving the injunctive orders of the Superior Court of Mecklenburg County entered in the proceeding of Tom B. Harris, et al. v. William C. Self, et al., 70 CVS 1097, and temporarily and permanently restrain any further proceedings in the action.

Plaintiffs further pray the Court for a temporary and permanent injunction against all defendants and all other parties having notice of the Court's order enjoining all parties in this action and all parties having notice of the orders of this Court from initiating or proceeding with any action in any State Court which has the purpose or effect of interfering with outstanding orders in this cause.

Plaintiffs further pray that the Court enter a temporary and permanent injunction restraining the Governor, the State Board of Education, the Controller of the State Department of Public Instruction, and the State Superintendent of Public Instruction from denying State funds or taking any other steps which would prevent or tend to prevent the implementation of the orders of this Court.

Plaintiffs further pray the Court for a temporary and permanent injunction directing the local Board of Education, its members individually, the Governor of the State, the State Board of Education, the State Superintendent of Public Instruction, and all other persons having any authority or responsibility in the administration of the public schools in Charlotte-Mecklenburg County to proceed forthwith with all necessary steps to implement the orders of this Court, including the provision requiring transportation of students living more than "walking distance" from the schools to which they are assigned. Plaintiffs further pray the Court for a temporary and permanent injunction restraining all defendants from taking any steps or action which would inhibit or prevent or tend to prevent compliance with the orders of this Court.

Plaintiffs further pray the Court that they be allowed their costs in this proceeding and reasonable counsel fees.

Plaintiffs further pray that the Court direct the United States Marshal to personally serve a copy of the complaint, the amended complaint, and all orders, including the injunctive order prayed for herein, upon all defendants named herein.

Respectfully submitted,

CONRAD O. PEARSON
203 1/2 East Chapel Hill Street
Durham, North Carolina

CHAMBERS, STEIN, FERGUSON AND LANNING
216 West Tenth Street
Charlotte, North Carolina

JACK GREENBERG
JAMES M. NABRIT, III
NORMAN CHACHKIN
10 Columbus Circle
New York, New York 10019

Attorneys for Plaintiffs

IN THE DISTRICT COURT OF THE UNITED STATES
FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF NORTH CAROLINA
Charlotte Division
Civil Action No. 1974

JAMES E. SWANN, et al,
Plaintiffs,
-vs-
CHARLOTTE-MECKLENBURG BOARD OF EDUCATION, a public body corporate; WILLIAM E. POE; HENDERSON BELK; DAN HOOD; BEN F. HUNTLEY; BETSEY KELLY; COLEMAN W. KERRY, JR.; JULIA MAULDEN; SAM McNINCH, III; CARLTON G. WATKINS; THE NORTH CAROLINA STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION, a public body corporate; and DR. A. CRAIG PHILLIPS, Superintendent of Public Instruction of the State of North Carolina,
Defendants,
and
HONORABLE ROBERT W. SCOTT, Governor of the State of North Carolina; HONORABLE A. C. DAVIS, Controller of the State Department of Public Instruction; HONORABLE WILLIAM K. McLEAN, Judge of the Superior Court of Mecklenburg County; TOM B. HARRIS; G. DON ROBERSON; A. BREECE BRELAND; JAMES M. POSTELL; WILLIAM E. RORIE, JR.; CHALMERS R. CARR; ROBERT T. WILSON; and the CONCERNED PARENTS ASSOCIATION, an unincorporated association in Mecklenburg County; JAMES CARSON and WILLIAM H. BOOE,
Additional Parties-Defendant.

ORDER

Upon motion duly made, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that the following persons and organizations described in the petition of the plaintiffs as additional parties-defendant be, and they are hereby made parties herein:

HONORABLE ROBERT W. SCOTT, Governor of the State of North Carolina

HONORABLE A. C. DAVIS, Controller of the State Department of Public Instruction

HONORABLE WILLIAM K. McLEAN, Judge of the Superior Court of North Carolina

TOM B. HARRIS, Charlotte, North Carolina

G. DON ROBERSON, Charlotte, North Carolina

A. BREECE BRELAND, Charlotte, North Carolina

JAMES M. POSTELL, Charlotte, North Carolina

WILLIAM E. RORIE, JR., Charlotte, North Carolina

CHALMERS R. CARR, Charlotte, North Carolina

ROBERT T. WILSON, Charlotte, North Carolina

CONCERNED PARENTS ASSOCIATION, an unincorporated association in Mecklenburg County, North Carolina

JAMES H. CARSON, JR., Attorney, Charlotte, North Carolina

WILLIAM H. BOOE, Attorney, Charlotte, North Carolina

It is directed that service of the following documents be made immediately by certified mail, return receipt requested, upon the additional parties hereby made:

1. MOTION TO ADD ADDITIONAL PARTIES DEFENDANT AND FOR FURTHER RELIEF, with attached POINTS OF AUTHORITY, served by plaintiffs on February 13, 1970.

2. NOTIFICATION AND REQUEST FOR DESIGNA-

TION OF THREE-JUDGE COURT, dated February 19, 1970, including exhibits referred to therein, as follows:

Exhibit A—OPINION AND ORDER filed December 1, 1969.

Exhibit B—ORDER filed February 5, 1970.

Exhibit C—ORDER filed December 2, 1969.

Exhibit D—Complaint, amended complaint and two orders entered by Judge William K. McLean on February 12, 1970, in suit pending in the General Court of Justice, Superior Court Division, Mecklenburg County, North Carolina, bearing No. 70-CVS-1097.

Exhibit E—Statement made by Governor Robert W. Scott on February 11, 1970.

Exhibit F—Letter dated February 12, 1970, written by Governor Robert W. Scott to Dr. W. L. Turner, Director of the North Carolina Department of Administration.

Exhibit G—Statement made by Dr. A. Craig Phillips on February 11, 1970.

3. DESIGNATION OF THREE-JUDGE COURT, filed February 24, 1970.

The plaintiffs are directed to prepare and file on or before Monday, March 2, 1970, proposed findings of fact and conclusions of law and a proposed order, and a brief in support of their position.

The other parties are directed to prepare and file on or before Friday, March 6, 1970, proposed findings of fact and conclusions of law and a proposed order, and a brief in support of their position.

If there is any additional evidence which any party desires to introduce by deposition or affidavit, the court will receive such evidence, in written form, up to and including Friday,

March 6, 1970. It is not contemplated that any more oral testimony in a court hearing will be necessary.

The hearing before the three-judge court will not be an evidentiary hearing, but will be a hearing based upon the record which has been developed by the time of the hearing.

This the 25th day of February, 1970.

James B. McMillan
United States District Judge

IN THE DISTRICT COURT OF THE UNITED STATES
FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF NORTH CAROLINA
Charlotte Division

JAMES E. SWANN, et al., Plaintiffs, v. CHARLOTTE-MECKLENBURG BOARD OF EDUCATION; NORTH CAROLINA STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION; DR. A. CRAIG PHILLIPS, Superintendent of Public Instruction of the State of North Carolina, et als., Defendants. AND HONORABLE ROBERT H. SCOTT, Governor of the State of North Carolina; HONORABLE A. C. DAVIS, Controller of the State Department of Public Instruction; HONORABLE WILLIAM K. McLEAN, Judge of the Superior Court of Mecklenburg County, et als., Additional Parties Defendant.	CIVIL ACTION NO. 1974

ANSWER TO MOTION TO ADD ADDITIONAL PARTIES DEFENDANT AND FOR FURTHER RELIEF

THE DEFENDANTS, THE NORTH CAROLINA STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION, DR. A. CRAIG PHILLIPS, SUPERINTENDENT OF PUBLIC INSTRUCTION, ROBERT H. SCOTT, GOVERNOR OF THE STATE OF NORTH CAROLINA, A. C. DAVIS, CONTROLLER OF THE STATE DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC INSTRUCTION, AND WILLIAM K. McLEAN, JUDGE OF THE SUPERIOR COURT OF MECKLENBURG COUNTY (hereinafter referred to as: STATE OFFICIALS), ANSWERING THE MOTION TO ADD ADDITIONAL PARTIES DEFENDANT, AND FOR FURTHER RELIEF, FOR THEIR ANSWERS ALLEGE:

(1) It is admitted that on February 5, 1970, the District Court of the United States for the Western District of North Carolina entered an order directing the Charlotte-Mecklenburg Board of Education to desegregate the public schools administered by said Board; it is further admitted that the Court ordered that students be assigned to the various public school facilities of said Board under plans adopted by the Board and by the Court's consultant, and all orders and plans are referred to and made a part of this allegation not for the purpose of acquiescing therein or admitting the validity thereof, but for the purpose of showing the action taken by the Court and the action taken by the Board; it is denied that any action to which the motion of the plaintiffs refers was taken by the Charlotte-Mecklenburg Board of Education as a voluntary act on the part of said Board, but, to the contrary, these defendants allege that each such action taken was compelled by orders of the Court; the plaintiffs themselves in their allegations refer to orders of the Court and directives of the Court.

(2) It is admitted that a group of individuals, an unincorporated association by the name of "Concerned Parents Association", instituted an action in the Superior Court of Mecklenburg County and obtained an order from a Superior Court judge enjoining the superintendent from paying expenses and fees of the Court consultant; that said civil action now pending in the Superior Court of Mecklenburg County and all its pleadings, orders and proceedings are hereby referred to and made a part of this Answer; it is further alleged that said "Concerned Parents Association" had a right under the laws of the State of North Carolina to institute said action, which is related to the use of public funds, including the proceeds of taxes collected from and paid by members of the said Association and other persons similarly situated; it is admitted that said civil action in the Superior Court of Mecklenburg County was instituted prior to the filing of the Order of the District Court of the United States on February 5, 1970.

(3) It is admitted that on February 12, 1970, the "Concern-

ed Parents Association" obtained an order from the Judge of the Superior Court of Mecklenburg County, enjoining the Charlotte-Mecklenburg Board of Education from spending any public funds to purchase and operate school buses for the purpose of redressing any racial imbalance. It is denied, however, that said Order was obtained to obstruct the enforcement of any lawful order of the District Court of the United States, but, to the contrary, said Order was obtained to prevent the busing of school children for the purpose of changing the racial composition of the student enrollment in specific public schools by compelling school children to attend a specific public school contrary to the will of their parents solely because of the race of such children, contrary to the Fourteenth Amendment to the Constitution of the United States as construed in BROWN v. BOARD OF EDUCATION, 347 U. S. 483, 98 L. ed. 873, 74 S. Ct. 686, 38 ALR 2d 1180, and contrary to the Civil Rights Act of 1964, and Chapter 1274 of the Session Laws of 1969, enacted by the General Assembly of North Carolina; that the Superior Court of Mecklenburg County had a legal right to pass upon the statutes and status of busing pupils and to enter the order therein complained of by the plaintiffs, and the prosecution of the action in the State courts is not subject to injunction or restraint on the part of the District Court of the United States; that the action in the State courts is lawfully brought therein to enjoin the unlawful expenditure of State funds and County funds, these being a matter of State law over which the United States District Court has no jurisdiction.

(4) It is admitted that Robert H. Scott, Governor of the State of North Carolina, ordered and directed that no public State funds be expended for the busing of public school pupils to redress racial imbalance as he had a right and duty to do under the Executive Budget Act of the State of North Carolina inasmuch as he was dealing with and preventing an unlawful expenditure of the State's public funds which are subject to the control of the State of North Carolina and its administrative authorities; that the lawful use which may be made of such funds is a matter of State law and involves no question arising

under the Constitution or laws of the United States; it is further admitted that the State Superintendent of Public Instruction of North Carolina and the defendant, North Carolina State Board of Education, approve the action taken by the Governor of North Carolina in the use of State funds, which, it is alleged, do not belong to the Federal Government, and which are not subject to allocation by agents of the Federal Government; that said action was taken pursuant to the statutes above referred to, which prohibit the use of the said State funds for the busing of public school children for the mere purpose of redressing racial imbalance.

(5) That these defendants, State officials, do not know the motives and intentions of the Honorable James Carson, a member of the House of Representatives of the State of North Carolina, and, therefore, for lack of information and belief deny the allegations related to the Honorable James Carson and also deny the allegations as to the motives and intentions of other persons in relation to said Court order for lack of information and belief.

(6) It is denied that the North Carolina State Board of Education and the State Superintendent of Public Instruction have any statutory duties or any duties at all in regard to the transportation of school children; it is further alleged that the local boards of education are under no legal duty to provide transportation for school children to, from and between their homes and the schools in which said children are enrolled; that said Board of Education has no authority or control over the transportation of pupils in the public school system, and neither the Governor of North Carolina nor the North Carolina State Board of Education is required or permitted to allocate funds for public school transportation of pupils for purposes prohibited by Federal and State statutes; that these defendants, State officials, do not know the intentions of the Charlotte-Mecklenburg Board of Education as to providing school buses for the transportation of school pupils to redress racial imbalance, and, therefore, deny all allegations relating to said subject.

(7) It is denied that these defendants are seeking to prevent desegregation of the public schools administered by the Charlotte-Mecklenburg Board of Education or to thwart any proper activity of this Court; it is further denied that these defendants are inciting disobedience of the law and seeking the overthrow of law and order or to coerce, or compel, school officials to desist or refrain from any duty imposed upon them by the Constitution or laws of the United States; that these defendants, State officials, are informed and believe, and so allege, that they have no authority to and may not lawfully be required to use State public funds contrary to the provisions of Chapter 1274 of the Session Laws of 1969, which expressly prohibits the use of such funds for the purpose of financing the transportation of public school children to, from and between their homes and the school wherein they are enrolled for the purpose of changing the ratio of the children of the respective races attending such schools or any other school; that A. C. Davis is Controller of the State Board of Education and not the Controller of the State Department of Public Instruction; that the said Davis is an administrative officer only, and, as such, does not determine the policy of the State of the expenditure of public State funds for public school transportation and is not a proper and necessary party to this action; that the Governor of North Carolina is not a proper and necessary party to this action and should not be added as a party defendant, and such addition would constitute a suit against the State as prohibited by the Eleventh Amendment to the Constitution of the United States; that the Honorable William K. McLean is a Judge of the Superior Court of the State of North Carolina, and, as such, has the lawful right, authority and duty to hear and determine any and all civil actions instituted in any such Court over the sessions of which he is lawfully assigned to preside; that the action instituted on or about February 12, 1970, in the Superior Court of Mecklenburg County, to which reference is made in the motion of the plaintiffs in the present action, was lawfully instituted therein and it is the lawful right, authority and duty of the Honorable William McLean, or such

other judge as may from time to time be lawfully assigned to preside over the sessions of said Court, to hear and determine, subject to lawful appellate review, all issues of law and fact which have arisen or may arise in such action, and he may not lawfully be restrained from the lawful exercise of such jurisdiction and authority by the Order of this Court; that under the appropriate Federal statute of the United States Code (28 USCA 2283) he is immune from any restraint on the part of this Court which would prohibit him from hearing and lawfully determining the issues of law and fact in civil actions lawfully initiated in the said Superior Court, including said action to which the Motion of the plaintiffs in this action refers, and he is immune from restraint on the part of the Federal Court in the exercise by him of the said jurisdiction and authority to hear and determine, subject to lawful appellate review, all issues of law and fact arising in the said action, and, therefore, he may not lawfully be made a party to this action in this Court.

(8) That the plaintiffs are not entitled to a temporary or permanent injunction restraining the actions of these defendants, said State officials, nor are the plaintiffs entitled to any mandatory injunction requiring these defendants, State officials, to proceed with providing transportation to or for public school students; that all allegations as to issuance of injunctions relating to these defendants, State officials, are untrue and are denied; it is denied that as to these defendants, State officials, the plaintiffs are entitled to any costs or counsel fees.

WHEREFORE, having fully answered said Motion, these defendants, State officials, pray the Court as follows:

(a) That as to these defendants, State officials, the said Motion be dismissed;

(b) that all applications and requests for injunctions relating to the busing of the public school pupils for the redress of racial imbalance, or for any other purpose, as to these defendants, be dismissed and denied;

(c) that the plaintiffs' request for costs and counsel fees as to these defendants be denied;

(d) for such other and further relief as to the Court may seem proper and just, and that these defendants recover their costs incurred herein.

Robert Morgan
Attorney General of North Carolina

Ralph Moody
Deputy Attorney General

Andrew A. Vanore, Jr.
Assistant Attorney General

IN THE DISTRICT COURT OF THE UNITED STATES
FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF NORTH CAROLINA
Charlotte Division

James E. Swann, et al,)
Plaintiffs,)
)
-vs-)
) CIVIL 1974
The Charlotte-Mecklenburg Board of Education, et al,)
)
Defendants.)

DEPOSITION OF:
JAMES H. CARSON, JR.
March 11, 1970

By consent this deposition was taken on March 11, 1970, at 11:15 A.M., in the offices of Chambers, Stein, Ferguson & Lanning, Attorneys at Law, 216 W. 10th Street, Charlotte, North Carolina.

By consent all objections except as to the form of the question are waived and objections will be made and ruled on at the time of trial. With the consent of all counsel, signature is waived.

APPEARANCES:

Plaintiffs—Julius L. Chambers, Esq.
Attorney at Law
Charlotte, North Carolina

Adam Stein, Esq.
Attorney at Law
Charlotte, North Carolina

Defendants—William J. Waggoner, Esq.
Attorney at Law
Charlotte, North Carolina

JAMES H. CARSON, Jr.,
having first been duly sworn, was examined and testified as follows:

BY MR. CHAMBERS:

Q Would you state your name, please?

A James H. Carson, Jr.

Q What is your address, Mr. Carson?

A 419 Ellsworth Road, Charlotte.

Q What is your occupation?

A I am an attorney.

Q Did you serve as a member of the Mecklenburg delegation to the North Carolina Legislature during the 1969 session?

A Yes, I served as a member from the 36th House District which is composed of only Mecklenburg County.

Q How long have you served in the Legislature?

A I was elected for the first time in 1966 and re-elected in 1968. I'm still in office.

Q Did you during the session of the 1969 Legislature have occasion to propose a bill that has now been enacted and is known as North Carolina General Statute Section 115-176.1?

A Yes, I did.

Q I show you a document which we would like to have marked as Plaintiff's Exhibit 1 for Mr. Carson's deposition. (Carson Deposition Exhibit #1 marked for identification and attached to all copies of this deposition.) I'll ask you if you would state whether that is a copy of the bill that you introduced.

A The exhibit consists of several items, one of which is a copy of the bill I introduced.

Q Would the last two pages of that exhibit be the bill as you originally introduced it?

A Yes, that's correct, the one entitled House Bill DRH 255.

Q And they are the last two pages on the exhibit?

A Yes, that's correct.

Q The third page from the back, which is the fifth page in the exhibit from the front, headed Amendment, dated June 16, '69, would this be a proposed amendment that was also incorporated in the bill?

A Yes, it would.

MR. WAGGONER: May I have a copy of this?

MR. CHAMBERS: I'm sorry.

Q Now, the third and fourth pages from the front, would you state what these two pages are?

A This is a House Committee Substitute for House Bill 990, which is the same bill.

Q Is it amended in any way from the bill as you originally introduced it?

A Yes. A Committee Substitute is used when a bill is rewritten to any degree to get a Committee Substitute rather than the original bill.

Q What changes were made in the Committee Substitute?

A I would have to read both bills to tell you the exact changes. You can see they are both here and the changes included in each of them were made in the Committee Substitute.

Q The first page and the second page of this exhibit, are these also amendments that were added to the bill?

A Yes. These are two amendments that were put into the Committee Substitute when it was considered in the Senate.

Q And were these amendments as indicated on the first two pages adopted by the House and the Senate?

A Yes, they were. They were adopted by the Senate and the House concurred in the Senate amendments.

Q Now, when did you initially propose the bill that subsequently became General Statute 115-176.1?

A By proposed, do you mean when did I introduce it?

Q Yes.

A I do not recall the exact date.

Q Do you recall the month?

A Of my own knowledge, no, I do not recall the month.

Q I show you another document which we would like marked as Plaintiff's Exhibit 2 for purposes of Mr. Carson's deposition. (Carson Deposition Exhibit #2 marked for identification and attached to all copies of this deposition.) Now, this document on the first page contains a news article headed "House Gets Busing Bill", June 12, 1969. To your knowledge would the bill have been presented to the House in June of 1969?

A To the best of my knowledge it was before the month of June when it was first introduced, either in April or May and I don't recall which month.

Q Do you recall whether it was subsequent to the Court's order entered in this case on April 23, 1969?

A No, I do not recall. I believe it was subsequent to that but I do not recall.

Q Now, as initially proposed, what was your purpose or what were you trying to remedy in proposing this bill?

MR. WAGGONER: Objection.

A The purpose of the bill, I think, could be best summed up by the title of the bill, that is, a bill to protect the neighborhood school system and to prohibit the involuntary busing of pupils outside the district in which they reside.

Q As initially proposed did you intend to prohibit consideration of race in the assignment of pupils?

MR. WAGGONER: Objection.

A The original bill does not mention race. It doesn't prohibit it or do anything else with it.

Q Are you familiar with the present provisions of the State in providing transportation for students?

A I'm vaguely familiar with them, yes. I'm not an expert on the subject.

Q Do you know whether the State presently provides transportation for students?

A Yes, I do know that under certain circumstances they do.

Q Do you recall what circumstances?

A To the best of my knowledge they provide transportation for pupils outside cities who live a mile and a half or more than a mile and a half from the school to which they are assigned and inside of cities in areas which have been recently incorporated, I believe since '57, the same provision applies.

Q Are you familiar with the North Carolina constitutional provision that required separation of the races in public education?

A Yes, I am.

Q Are you familiar with the previous practices of this School Board in providing transportation of students on a segregated basis?

A No, I'm really not familiar with it. I imagine it was done but this was some years ago and I'm not that familiar with it now.

Q Do you know whether the School Board has provided transportation, this School Board, for Negro students going to Negro schools and white students going to white schools?

A No, I do not. I have never been on a school bus myself. I lived near the school I attended and I do not know.

Q You do know we have had segregated schools in this system.

A Yes, I do.

Q And you do know that transportation was provided during the period that we had segregated schools.

A I suppose outside of the city it was. Of my own knowledge, though, I do not know.

Q I show you a copy of the exhibit that was attached to the supplemental complaint filed by the plaintiffs in this case which shows the bill with the date May 7. Does that refresh your recollection as to the date of the bill?

A No. I would assume May 7th is correct because it's stamped on the bill but I do not recall of my own personal knowledge.

Q You don't have any reason to believe that it wasn't May 7.

A No, I do not.

Q Now, do you know the number of students in Mecklenburg County who are transported daily to school?

A No, I do not.

Q Do you know the number of pupils transported to school daily across the State of North Carolina?

A No, I do not.

Q Do you know the average mileage traveled by buses each day in transporting students to school in Mecklenburg County?

A I have no idea what that would be.

Q Now, did you know the number of students or the average miles per day traveled when you introduced this bill?

A The average number of students in Mecklenburg County?

Q Yes.

A No, I did not.

Q Or the average number in the State?

A No, I did not.

Q Or the average mileage?

A No, I did not.

Q Do you know the purpose of the State in providing transportation for students?

A I would assume that the purpose is to provide transportation primarily for the rural children who live some distance from school and who would find it difficult to arrange their own transportation.

Q Do you know how long the State has been providing transportation at public expense?

A Ever since I can remember, which would be twenty-five or so years. I'm sure it's been longer than that, though.

Q The proposed amendment that you submitted June 16, 1969, what was the purpose of this amendment?

MR. WAGGONER: Objection.

A This amendment, as best I recall, was aimed at providing some type of temporary assignment whereby if a school were damaged by fire or something else it would require a temporary assignment and would require pupils to be transported to another school district.

MR. WAGGONER: Move to strike.

Q Look at the first two pages of Exhibit 1. The first proposed amendment would strike the balance of the sentence on Page 1, Lines 14 and 15, following the word "various" and would add "races, creeds, colors or national origins from the community".

A Yes, I'm looking at it.

Q Do you know the purpose of that amendment?

MR. WAGGONER: Objection.

A As best I recall, this is a grammatical correction. I don't have House Bill 990 as it was approved by the House as amended by the Senate, but I believe this did not change the substance of the bill and was a grammatical correction.

Q Would you look at the second amendment on the same page?

A Yes.

Q What was the purpose of that amendment?

MR. WAGGONER: Objection.

A I can only give you the purpose as I understand it. These were put in by Senator Edwards of Guilford County and I couldn't testify as to what his purpose was. I can tell you what I think the amendment does.

MR. WAGGONER: Objection, move to strike.

Q Would you tell us what you think the amendment does?

MR. WAGGONER: Objection.

A Yes. It appears to me and as I recall it, the amendment is to cover the cases where you have a vocational school or a school for handicapped children, something of that nature, where you might have one in the entire community that this particular class of children would be assigned to and I believe that is why the Senator introduced this amendment.

MR. WAGGONER: Move to strike.

Q Now, you notice the last phrase in the amendment which reads "or for any other reason which the board of education in its sole discretion deems sufficient".

A Yes.

Q Would you tell us what you understand that provision to mean?

MR. WAGGONER: Objection.

A I understand it to mean just what it says. If the Board of Education in its discretion feels a transfer or reassignment is required that such would be allowed.

MR. WAGGONER: Move to strike.

Q And the statute would not apply in that instance?

A The statute would apply but it would not prohibit such actions.

MR. WAGGONER: Move to strike.

Q Would you consider this an absolute discretion of the School Board?

MR. WAGGONER: Objection.

A What I would consider it really, I think, is meaningless. It's what it says it is. My consideration of it would be a legal conclusion that I don't feel qualified to give.

Q Well, when you voted for the bill, what were your impressions at that time of the meaning of that provision?

MR. WAGGONER: Objection.

A My impression at that time was that it says just what it says right now, or for any other reason which the board of education in its sole discretion deems sufficient.

MR. WAGGONER: Move to strike.

Q Would this permit a Board in desegregating the schools to make assignments that considered race and to transport pupils in order to desegregate schools?

MR. WAGGONER: Objection.

A Would you read that question back, please?

(The Court Reporter reads the question on Page 10, Line 23.)

A I do not feel qualified to state a conclusion of law as to what this would or would not permit any Board of Education to do. This is a matter for the State or Federal Courts to determine and not for me to say.

Q We're trying to get something about the legislative history of the bill and we were interested in your impressions at that time what the meaning of the provision was. I understand that when the bill came back to the House you spoke in favor of the bill including the amendments. Would you give us your opinion, as you understood it at that time, whether this provision would permit a Board to desegregate the schools and to consider race in doing so?

MR. WAGGONER: Objection.

A In my opinion, and it's only my opinion, when the bill came back before the House it was not debated as to the amendments; that as the introducer of the bill I had one of two courses available. I could either move that we concur in the Senate amendment, in which event the bill would become ratified, or move that we do not concur in the Senate amendment, in which case a conference committee would be set up and the bill sent to the conference committee. I did move that the House concur in the Senate amendments. As best I recall, there was no debate on that motion and it passed unanimously. The opinion I had at the time that the bill came back to the Senate, the Board of Education would be allowed a great deal of latitude in assigning or reassigning students and giving them the sole discretion as to what would or would not be sufficient. It would appear to me there would be numerous instances where if the Board felt that such reassignment were required it would be allowed to do so.

MR. WAGGONER: Move to strike.

Q Would you look again at Plaintiff's Exhibit 2. The first news article there attempts to give the purpose of the bill, to preserve the neighborhood school concept, and it says also,

"Carson introduced the bill several weeks ago in the wake of a federal court ruling that ordered more integration of Charlotte-Mecklenburg schools." Would that be a correct statement?

MR. WAGGONER: Objection.

A I am not prepared to state whether or not a newspaper article from some paper not identified by some reporter that I do not know is correct or incorrect. I have testified as to the date that the bill was introduced. I said I had no reason to believe it was other than May 7th. I do not recall the date of any particular court ruling in Mecklenburg County and I think that the record will have to be considered to see whether it was before or after. As to the term "the wake of", I think that's meaningless. I think following or prior to would be a more accurate description.

Q The next paragraph reads: "At that time it was feared that students would have to be bused out of their districts to obey the court order." Would that be a correct statement of your consideration at the time that you introduced the bill?

MR. WAGGONER: Objection.

A My consideration as to what was "it was feared" would be nothing. I don't even know particularly what "it" means. Certainly the possibility of busing was foremost in my mind but as to whether or not this particular article is correct, I have no way of knowing.

MR. WAGGONER: Move to strike.

Q Was not this possibility suggested in the April 23 order of the Court in this case?

A I believe the possibility has been suggested on numerous occasions both before and after April or May and I think it had been coming or the possibility had been forthcoming for a long time, I'd say probably—I don't know—a year or so or more.

Q You do know there was quite some concern at that time in

Mecklenburg County about the order of the Court, the April 23 order.

A There has been a great deal of concern in Mecklenburg County throughout the matter both before and after April of '69.

Q And was it not foremost in your mind at the time you introduced the bill?

MR. WAGGONER: Objection.

A The concern of the people of Mecklenburg County and the State of North Carolina has always been foremost in my mind in introducing any bill.

MR. WAGGONER: Motion to strike.

Q Would you turn to the second page of Plaintiff's Exhibit 2. By the way, the first page is an article from the Charlotte News. The second page is an article from the Charlotte Observer.

A Yes, I'm referring to it now.

Q Is that a correct report of the House consideration on the date indicated?

MR. WAGGONER: Objection.

A I have no way of knowing to my personal knowledge whether it's a correct report of the House consideration or not.

Q Would you turn to the third page?

A Yes, I'm referring to the third page.

Q That is an article from the Charlotte Observer dated June 18, 1969. Would you look at that article?

A Yes, I'm referring to it.

Q Would you look at the last column on that page?

MR. WAGGONER: Let me get through the thing.

MR. CHAMBERS: OK.

A Yes, I have read the final column.

Q Are the quotations there correct?

A Which particular quotations are you referring to?

Q The first quotation is, "Carson replied that Charlotte-Mecklenburg's board was "very interested" in the bill and that he thought "others" would be."

A Yes, I'm confident that the Charlotte-Mecklenburg Board would be very interested in the bill and others would be, too.

Q Did you make the statement?

A I don't recall.

Q Would the second quotation there coming from Representative Fred Mills be correct?

MR. WAGGONER: Objection, hearsay.

A I don't recall.

Q Look down, the report shows a question asked you by Rep. Arthur H. Jones of Mecklenburg regarding any possible conflict between the bill and the decision of the Court should that become law. Would the quotation there coming from you be correct?

A Not completely, no. There could be a conflict or there could not be, depending on what the Local Board decided to do.

Q Do you recall whether you said: "Well, of course, I see a a conflict. If there were no conflict I don't think there would be any need for the bill."

MR. WAGGONER: Objection.

A I don't recall whether I said it or not. I don't deny it, I just don't recall it.

Q You might have said it?

A Yes.

Q You said that there might be . . .

MR. WAGGONER: Objection.

Q There might not be a conflict depending on what the Board decided to do.

A Yes.

MR. WAGGONER: Objection.

Q Will you explain that?

A I'll explain it as I think I do now because I don't have a recollection of what I thought at this particular moment. I think there would be a conflict if the Board were to decide to involuntarily bus students for the sole purpose of achieving a racial balance.

Q Even with the provision in the act that the Board could do anything within its discretion?

MR. WAGGONER: Objection.

A This again calls for a conclusion of law. I don't necessarily think there would be a conflict. There may be one. If the Board took the position that education in Mecklenburg County would suffer and the public school system would suffer but they still wanted to provide transportation for the sole purpose of achieving a racial balance, I don't think the Board would be allowed to do this.

MR. WAGGONER: Motion to strike.

Q Mr. Carson, would you tell us in your opinion your difference between achieving a racial balance and desegregating the schools?

MR. WAGGONER: Objection.

A I think achieving a racial balance would be much easier of the two to define. I think a racial balance in Mecklenburg County would be roughly 70-30 in each school within the county. As far as ending desegregation goes, this, of course, is a most difficult question that I am not competent to

answer and I don't know of anyone who is. The Court decisions have been, to me at least, very ambiguous as to what must be done to end segregation. Whether or not it means assigning all pupils without regard to race, creed, color or national origin or whether it goes further to mean that race, creed, color and national origin must be considered to achieve a mixture of race as far as practical, I just would not feel competent to answer that question.

MR. WAGGONER: Motion to strike.

Q Would you look at the next page, which is an article from the Charlotte Observer dated June 26, 1969.

A Yes, I am referring to that now.

Q Do you recall seeing this article in the paper?

A No, I don't recall seeing this article in the paper.

Q Were you in court in the hearing of this case in August of 1969 when the Court considered the Board's plan that was subsequently approved for the 1969-70 school year?

A I don't recall. I have been at the hearings on two or three occasions for relatively short period of time.

Q Are you familiar with the Board's plan for 1969-70 that provides for reassignment of Negro students from the inner-city schools to white schools?

A You mean the closing of the six or seven schools?

Q Yes.

A Yes, I am vaguely familiar with it. I have not read it myself but I have followed it in the newspapers and through the other media.

Q Are you familiar with the provision of the plan that provided for reassignment of Negro students from overcrowded Negro schools in the inner-city?

A I know that some schools had been closed in the inner-city.

I did not know some were overcrowded and portions of the pupils from the overcrowded schools were transferred out, no.

Q Are you familiar with the provision of the plan that provided transportation for the Negro students to attend the white schools?

A Yes.

Q Do you recall comments by counsel for the School Board at that time about the provision of the statute that authorized the Board to make a reassignment in its discretion?

MR. WAGGONER: Objection.

A I don't recall the comment.

Q Did you consider the reassignment of the Negro students for 1969 and the transportation being provided for them a violation of the bill?

MR. WAGGONER: I object. The witness stated he really hasn't read the plan and doesn't know what it did.

A No, I do not think it would be a violation of the bill. I think the overcrowded portions of it would be certainly within the discretion of the School Board and would be specifically covered by the act. As for the other part, as far as I know the reassignment and transportation was on a voluntary basis and the School Board allowed children who did not wish to be transported to the outer portions of the city to be reassigned to the school closest to their home. And certainly providing transportation for the pupils in the inner-city who wanted to be transported outside would not be prohibited by the bill.

Q That's the voluntary nature of the bill?

A Yes.

Q Now, the Bill prohibits involuntary transportation. Would you define or tell us what you meant by involuntary?

MR. WAGGONER: Objection.

A Yes. The involuntary would refer to the pupils and to their parents or guardians.

Q They would be the ones who would make the decision?

A Yes, as to whether or not they wanted to attend a school near their home or whether they wanted to be transported to another locality.

MR. WAGGONER: Motion to strike.

Q Would that present some conflict with the other provision of the bill that permitted the Board to assign students within its discretion?

A No, I don't think that would present any conflict.

Q If the Board decided to assign students and the students objected, would such assignments be in violation of the act?

MR. WAGGONER: Objection.

A That would depend on a great many circumstances and also would require a conclusion of law from me. I would have to say that under certain circumstances it might and under others it might not.

Q Would you define some of those circumstances that it might?

MR. WAGGONER: Objection.

A That it might be a possible conflict?

Q Yes.

A Yes. As I said, if the School Board decided that they were going to transport pupils merely to achieve a racial balance and that education of any of the students would not be improved but that the School Board felt they had to have such a balance anyway, I think that this would be a conflict.

MR. WAGGONER: Motion to strike.

Q Will you define some of the exceptions where it would not be a conflict?

MR. WAGGONER: Objection.

A Yes. I think if you had a school that was overcrowded or if you had a school that were damaged by fire and the Board felt that the pupils should be assigned to another school, either on a temporary or more than a temporary basis in the case of overcrowding, I think it clearly would not be, whether or not the pupils wanted to go.

MR. WAGGONER: Motion to strike.

Q Suppose you had a segregated school and the Board had to reassign in order to desegregate the school?

MR. WAGGONER: Objection.

A Well, this gets into another difficult question. When you say the Board had to reassign to desegregate, if the constitution requires such an assignment, of course not. If the constitution does not require such an assignment, yes, it would.

MR. WAGGONER: Motion to strike.

Q We discussed this bill previously, looking forward to securing an affidavit from you and you made a statement at that time that you considered the altering of school boundaries and the pairing of schools for the sole purpose of creating a racial balance to be in violation of the act, but the altering of school districts, the pairing of schools and other methods designed to eliminate the effects of past racial discrimination would not necessarily be.

MR. WAGGONER: Objection.

A Yes, that's correct.

MR. WAGGONER: Motion to strike. May I have a copy of the affidavit?

MR. CHAMBERS: It's not an affidavit.

MR. WAGGONER: Well, it's a document.

MR. CHAMBERS: You may.

Q You also stated at that time that you considered the determination of involuntary to be that of the school children and their parents.

A Yes.

MR. WAGGONER: Objection.

Q You also stated at that time that the bill was amended in the Senate to vest the discretion in the Local Board to make alterations in the method of assigning pupils discretionary?

MR. WAGGONER: Objection.

A Yes.

MR. WAGGONER: Motion to strike.

A Within limits.

Q What limits?

MR. WAGGONER: Objection.

A Well, the ones that we have just mentioned.

Q You also made a statement at that time that you did not consider the discretion vested in the Board to be absolute but that some reason must be given, such as a finding that racial balance in the school would promote the educational program or that the constitution requires racial balance in the schools.

MR. WAGGONER: Objection.

A Yes.

Q Is that correct?

A Yes.

MR. WAGGONER: Motion to strike.

Q You made a statement at that time that you did not think that the act would cover the situation where a school was converted from certain grade levels to other grade levels and students residing near the school would be required to be

transported to other schools serving their grade levels except where the distance involved would be extensive and/or there would be other schools in between the schools to which the students were being transported.

MR. WAGGONER: Objection.

A Yes, that's correct. I don't think this particular act applies to that.

MR. WAGGONER: Motion to strike.

Q You also made a statement that in your opinion the act would limit the kinds of plan or approaches that a School Board might follow in seeking to create a racial balance.

MR. WAGGONER: Objection.

A Yes, that's right.

MR. WAGGONER: Motion to strike.

Q You stated that in your opinion a requirement that there be a racial balance of students in each school in the system which also requires transportation would be violative of the act.

MR. WAGGONER: Objection.

A Would you read that question back, please?

(The Court Reporters reads the question on Line 7 above.)

A Yes, that's correct.

Q You stated that in your opinion the pairing of schools or redrawing of attendance lines to achieve a racial balance whether or not transportation of students is required would be a violation of the act.

MR. WAGGONER: Objection.

A Yes, to achieve a racial balance.

MR. WAGGONER: Motion to strike.

A But not to create a unitary school system.

Q To create a unitary school system, then, even though transportation is provided, would not be a violation of the act?

MR. WAGGONER: Objection.

A Not necessarily, no.

MR. WAGGONER: Motion to strike.

Q The April 23 order of the Court authorized the School Board to consider many means for desegregation including transportation. In your opinion would this bill limit the kinds of considerations that a Board might employ to desegregate schools?

MR. WAGGONER: Objection on incompetence and to the forum.

A Not necessarily. Certainly some types of transportation would not be affected at all by the bill. For example, if the Board decided all inner-city students should be given an option of attending the perimeter schools if they desired and provided transportation for them, it certainly would not.

MR. WAGGONER: Motion to strike.

Q Would there be some limitations placed, however, on the methods that a Board might utilize in desegregating schools?

MR. WAGGONER: Objection.

A There would be some limits placed on it, yes.

MR. WAGGONER: Motion to strike.

Q Would you tell us what those limitations would be or some of them might be?

A Yes. An obvious limitation would be the transportation of students across town for the sole purpose of achieving a racial balance.

Q Are you familiar with the plan that was directed by the Court on February 5, 1970?

A Vaguely familiar with it, yes.

Q Would the bill prevent implementation of that plan?

MR. WAGGONER: Objection.

A I would want to know specifically what in the plan you would be talking about before I could answer that.

Q Would it prevent the clustering of schools and the transportation of pupils as the Court directed?

MR. WAGGONER: Objection.

A If it were for the sole purpose of achieving a racial balance, Yes, I think it would.

MR. WAGGONER: Motion to strike.

Q Well, as you presently understand the plan, you're familiar with the clustering of schools directed by the Court, are you not?

A Yes.

Q And the pairing and the transportation provisions also.

A Yes.

Q In your opinion does this bill prohibit the Board from implementing that plan?

MR. WAGGONER: Objection.

A Yes. In my opinion . . . well, the entire plan, yes, I do think it would prohibit it, certain portions of it.

MR. WAGGONER: Motion to strike.

Q Would those portions be the clustering of schools and the transportation of the pupils in the thirty-four schools involved?

MR. WAGGONER: Objection.

A Just so I know exactly what you're talking about, tell me what you mean by clustering of schools as opposed to pairing.

A I guess we're talking about the same thing in clustering and pairing. You're familiar that the order requires that thirty-four schools be paired, ten black and twenty-four white.

A Yes.

Q And provides that transportation be provided for students reassigned for the purpose of desegregating those schools.

A Yes.

Q Now, would the bill prohibit implementation of that order?

MR. WAGGONER: Objection.

A Yes, in my opinion it would to the extent that the order is written.

Q Now, the April 23 order includes the following: "Neighborhood" in Charlotte tends to be a group of homes generally similar in race and income. Location of schools in Charlotte has followed the local pattern of residential development, including its de facto patterns of segregation. With a few significant exceptions, such as Olympic High School (about 1/3 black) and Randolph Road Junior High School (23% black), the schools which have been built recently have been black or almost completely black, or white or almost completely white, and this probability was apparent and predictable when the schools were built. Specific instances include Albemarle Road Elementary (99+ white); Beverly Woods (100% white); Bruns Avenue (99% + black); Hidden Valley (100% white); Olde Providence (98% white); Westerly Hills (100% white); Albemarle Road Junior High (93% white)." Then the Court writes on about the distance people drive to work and to church and to football games and other affairs. Now, to desegregate these recently built schools would the act prohibit the Board from making assignments, assigning blacks to all white schools and whites to all black schools and providing transportation?

MR. WAGGONER: Objection.

A Now, specifically your question is whether or not, without considering all the figures you read out of which I have no personal knowledge but I assume to be correct, the Board would be prohibited from assigning children to achieve a racial balance, is that correct?

Q Well, if the schools were all white and the Board wanted to desegregate those schools by assigning some black kids to those schools and providing transportation, would the act prohibit the Board from doing this?

MR. WAGGONER: Objection.

A I would find that very difficult to answer. If you had a particular situation where, for instance, a particular school district were gerrymandered to include all the pupils of a certain race or to exclude pupils of a certain race, I would say clearly no, they could be redrawn and should be redrawn. But on the other hand, if you're going to transport pupils from one section of town to a distant section of town and at the same time have cross transportation for the sole purpose of achieving a racial balance, then I would say yes, that it would.

MR. WAGGONER: Motion to strike.

MR. CHAMBERS: I have nothing further.

BY MR. WAGGONER:

Q Mr. Carson, there were other sponsors of this bill with you, is this correct?

A That's correct.

Q Who were they?

A Rep. Johnson of Cabarrus County and Rep. Hegge of Davidson County.

Q You're not familiar with their intent insofar as the proposed bill is concerned, are you?

A Well, their intent, I would say, would be the same as mine

and the same as the other members of the General Assembly who gave it overwhelming approval.

Q How many members are there of the General Assembly?

A 170, 120 in the House and 50 in the Senate.

Q Are these gentlemen in a position to pass on the coverage of this bill with respect to the specific facts in Mecklenburg County?

A No. I would say very few would be very familiar with Mecklenburg County. They're from, of course, all across the State.

Q Do you know who proposed the amendments to the bill that you originally proposed?

A The Senate amendments?

Q Yes.

A Yes, I do. Senator Edwards of Guilford County.

Q Do you know his intent?

A Well, I think he thought it would make it a more workable and better bill if it were amended. One or two of the provisions were grammatical in nature.

MR. WAGGONER: I have nothing further.

MR. CHAMBERS: Thank you very much.

****

CERTIFICATE

I, Evelyn S. Berger, Notary Public/Reporter, do hereby certify that James H. Carson, Jr., was duly sworn by me prior to the taking of the foregoing deposition; that said deposition was taken and transcribed by me; and that the foregoing 80 pages constitute a true, complete and accurate transcript of the testimony of the said witness. I further certify that the persons were present as stated in the caption.

I further certify that I am not of counsel for, or in the em-

ployment of any of the parties to this action, nor am I interested in the results of this action.

In witness whereof, I have hereunto subscribed my name this 12th day of March, 1970.

Evelyn S. Berger
Notary Public in and for
County of Mecklenburg
State of North Carolina

GENERAL ASSEMBLY

AMENDMENT

Date ..... By: .....

COMMITTEE SUBSTITUTE OF

Amend S. B. ..... H. B. 990

Adopted June 24

(1) Page 1, Lines 14 and 15
by striking the balance of the sentence after the word "various" and re-writing it as follows: "races, creeds, colors or national origins from the community."

(2) Page 1, Line 18
by changing the period after the word "districts" to a semicolon, and adding the following: "provided, however, that the board of education of an administrative unit may assign any pupil to a school outside of such attendance district or zone in order that such pupil may attend a school of a specialized kind including but not limited to a vocational school or school operated for, or operating programs for, pupils mentally or physically handicapped, or for any other reason which the board of education in its

sole discretion deems sufficient.

(3) Page 2, Line 8
by striking the words "not to any" and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "nor to any assignment or"

(4) Page 2, Line 10
between the word "require" and "reassignment" insert the words "assignment or"

(5) Page 2, Line 13
by removing the period and quotation marks after the word "pupil" and adding the following: "or to any assignment made pursuant to a choice made by any pupil who is eligible to make such choice pursuant to the provisions of a freedom of choice plan voluntarily adopted by the board of education of an administrative unit."

Signed EDWARDS

SESSION 1969

Introduced by:

Representatives Carson, J. Johnson, and Hege

COMMITTEE SUBSTITUTE TO H. B. 990

Referred to:

A BILL TO BE ENTITLED

AN ACT TO PROTECT THE NEIGHBORHOOD SCHOOL SYSTEM AND TO PROHIBIT THE INVOLUNTARY BUSSING OF PUPILS OUTSIDE THE DISTRICT IN WHICH THEY RESIDE.

The General Assembly of North Carolina do enact:

Section 1. There is hereby created a new Section of Chapter

115 of the General Statutes to be codified as G.S. 115-176.1 and to read as follows:

"G.S. 115-176.1. *Assignment of pupils based on race, creed, color or national origin prohibited.* No person shall be refused admission into or be excluded from any public school in this State on account of race, creed, color or national origin. No school attendance district or zone shall be drawn for the purpose of segregating persons of various race, creed, color or national origin from the community.

Where administrative units have divided the geographic area into attendance districts or zones, pupils shall be assigned to schools within such attendance districts. No student shall be assigned or compelled to attend any school on account of race, creed, color or national origin, or for the purpose of creating a balance or ratio of race, religion or national origins. Involuntary bussing of students in contravention of this Article is prohibited, and public funds shall not be used for any such bussing.

The provisions of this Article shall not apply to a temporary assignment due to the unsuitability of a school for its intended purpose nor to any transfer necessitated by overcrowded conditions or other circumstances which, in the sole discretion of the School Board, require reassignment.

The provisions of this Article shall not apply to an application for the assignment or re-assignment by the parent, guardian or person standing in loco parentis of any pupil."

Sec. 2. All laws and clauses of laws in conflict with this Act are hereby repealed.

Sec. 3. If part of the Act is held to be in violation of the Constitution of the United States of North Carolina, such part shall be severed and the remainder shall remain in full force and effect.

Sec. 4. This Act shall be in full force and effect upon its ratification.

GENERAL ASSEMBLY

AMENDMENT

Date 16 June '69 By: Carson

Amend S. B. ..... H. B. 990

By adding a new paragraph on page two; line 14, following the word "Article" to read as follows:

The provision of this Article shall not apply to a temporary assignment of pupils. A temporary assignment shall be one for less than the school year resulting from conditions which temporarily render a school unacceptable.

House adopted 6/16/69

Signed JAMES H. CARSON, JR.

NORTH CAROLINA

GENERAL ASSEMBLY

1969 SESSION

HOUSE BILL DRH 255

Sponsors:

Representative Carson, J. Johnson, Hege

Referred to:

A BILL TO BE ENTITLED

AN ACT TO PROTECT THE NEIGHBORHOOD SCHOOL SYSTEM AND TO PROHIBIT THE INVOLUNTARY BUSSING OF PUPILS OUTSIDE THE DISTRICT IN WHICH THEY RESIDE.

The General Assembly of North Carolina do enact:

Section 1. There is hereby created a new Section of Chapter

115 of the General Statutes to be codified as G.S. 115-183.1 and to read as follows:

"G.S. 115-183.1. *Pupil assignment within neighborhood; involuntary bussing prohibited.* Notwithstanding any provisions of this or other Chapters, no pupil shall be assigned to a school outside the district in which he resides except upon the application of his parent, guardian, or person standing in loco parentis as hereinbefore provided.

Pupils residing within a district where two or more schools are located shall be assigned to the school which is closest to their place of residence unless application to attend elsewhere is made by the parent, guardian, or person standing in loco parentis. Applications for assignments outside the pupils' school district or to a school further from the pupils' residence than another school within the district shall be determined by the city or county board as hereinbefore set forth.

The city or county board may, in its discretion and subject to provisions as hereinbefore set forth, provide transportation for pupils assigned either within or without the district. Provided, however, students shall not be bussed or transported outside their respective districts or to a school more distant from their residences than another school within the district except in cases where the parent, guardian, or person standing in loco parentis has requested such assignment as hereinbefore set forth. Public funds, whether from taxation or any other source, shall not be used to provide transportation for pupils assigned in contravention of this Article."

Sec. 2. All laws and clauses of laws in conflict with this Act are hereby repealed.

Sec. 3. If part of the Act is held to be in violation of the Constitution of the United States or North Carolina, such part shall be severed and the remainder shall remain in full force and effect.

Sec. 4. This Act shall be in full force and effect upon its ratification.

HOUSE GETS BUSING BILL

RALEIGH—Rep. James H. Carson's bill to prohibit arbitrary busing of students to create racial balances in schools comes up for floor action today in the House.

The bill has been given a favorable report by the House Judiciary Committee.

Carson's bill seeks to preserve "neighborhood school" concept which means students will be assigned to schools nearest their homes.

Carson introduced the bill several weeks ago in the wake of a federal court ruling that ordered more integration of Charlotte-Mecklenburg schools.

At that time it was feared that students would have to be bused out of their districts to obey the court order.

Carson's bill prohibits the involuntary busing of students outside their school districts. But it does not prohibit busing students if they desire it.

ANTI-BUSING BILL GETS HOUSE OK

By JERRY ADAMS

Observer Raleigh Bureau

RALEIGH—Mecklenburg Rep. James H. Carson's bill that would prevent the busing of school children without parental consent passed its second reading in the N.C. House Monday night.

Rep. Henry E. Frye of Guilford County requested that the bill's final reading be delayed until today. Only one member need request that a bill not receive its second and third reading the same day.

The bill provides that a child must be assigned to the school

nearest his home unless parents consent to his assignment to another school.

Before explaining his bill, Carson added an amendment that would allow busing of a child "under temporary conditions" for less than a school year if, for instance, the originally assigned school burned down.

Carson has explained that the constitutionality of busing has never been tested in the courts, although the idea has been an emotional issue for years and has been suggested by the courts as one means of fostering desegregation.

The New York legislature has passed a similar law.

Frye, the only objector during brief debate over the bill, contended that the bill "doesn't give any discretion at all to the (local) board."

Frye suggested that if the Assembly wanted to express its wishes to local boards of education it would be better advised to pass a resolution—without the force of law. Frye also said that some districts in the state were not rigidly defined and that confusion could result from such a law.

'NO BUSING' BILL ROUSES CRITICS

By JERRY ADAMS

Observer Raleigh Bureau

RALEIGH—Opposition erupted in the House Tuesday to Mecklenburg Rep. James H. Carson's bill to prohibit involuntary busing of public school children.

The bill was detered from final passage and will be reconsidered today.

Opposition came from several quarters on the floor of the

House Tuesday although the bill was passed in its second reading Monday night after only Rep. Henry E. Frye of Guilford opposed it. Frye delayed the final vote until Tuesday when it looked Monday night as though the bill was headed for overwhelming approval by voice vote.

"Some people (the opposers) have had a chance to look at it," Frye said after Tuesday's session, during which he did not speak. "Things were going so well I thought I'd just stay out of it," he said.

The bill would prevent a school board from busing a child without his parents' approval to a school other than that nearest his home.

Busing is a crucial issue in school desegregation, although Carson argues that busing has never received a specific court test. Frye is the General Assembly's only Negro member.

Speaking of another local issue in desegregation, Carson said on the floor Tuesday that his bill "has nothing to do with the freedom-of-choice plan one way or another."

But Rep. Neill I. McFadyen of Hoke said the bill would be impossible to apply in areas where school attendance districts were not precisely drawn.

Saying that he had been chairman of his local school board, McFadyen continued:

"If we tell the boards at home exactly what to do, I don't see why we need these local boards."

Local boards "should have some right to have some freedom of choice," too, McFadyen said.

Rep. Ernest B. Messer of Haywood objected that "shifting population" in a city or county would require that local boards be able to use their own discretion about transferring pupils.

Carson hastily offered an amendment that would suspend

the law in a case where a school building were damaged or where overcrowding required "temporary" busing.

But Messer was still not satisfied.

"I think it is wrong and I think it will create some stumbling blocks throughout this state that we won't realize until we come up against them," Messer said.

Rep. Ike F. Andrews of Chatham asked if local boards "had requested for even approved this bill?"

Carson replied that Charlotte-Mecklenburg's board was "very interested" in the bill and that he thought "others" would be.

Rep. Fred M. Mills Jr. of Anson asked, "Mr. Carson, really don't you want this to apply to just Mecklenburg County?"

Mecklenburg's board is currently locked in a fight with the federal district court, which has offered busing as one solution to a de facto segregated situation that the court says must be resolved.

Mills also raised the question of a parent who might not "even admit" his child needed special education classes for which busing might be necessary.

And Rep. Arthur M. Jones of Mecklenburg asked Carson if he could "see any possible conflict with the bill—should it become law—and the current situation with the courts in Charlotte-Mecklenburg?"

Carson responded, "Well, of course, I see a conflict.

"If there were no conflict I don't think there would be any need for the bill."

Carson said the state attorney general's office had told him the bill was constitutional, "but could be applied unconstitutionally."

When Carson's attempts at amending the bill showed no

signs of mollifying critics, he asked that the bill be reconsidered today.

After the session, obviously delighted with his new-found support in opposition to the bill, Frye said that the bill runs counter to the "trend" of this General Assembly in giving more power to local government.

CARSON'S REWRITTEN ANTIBUSING BILL PASSES IN HOUSE VOICE VOTE

Observer Raleigh Bureau

RALEIGH—Mecklenburg Rep. James H. Carson's bill to prohibit busing of school children without parental consent won final approval in the House of Representatives Wednesday and now moves to the Senate.

The bill, which locks legal horns wtih a desegregation case in Charlotte-Mecklenburg, was passed in a form substantially rewritten from the original.

Rep. Henry E. Frye of Guilford, the General Assembly's only Negro and the member who first opposed the bill, was not present for the vote Wednesday.

Other House members who had questioned whether the bill restricted local school boards too much, also were silent, and the bill passed by an overwhelming voice vote.

The bill prohibits busing of children across attendance-district lines to establish racial "balances or ratios" in any school. The bill also prohibits the use of busing to segregate by race.

Drawn along the lines of a recently passed New York law, the bill conforms to guidelines established by the U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, Carson said.

"In my opinion, the bill probably is constitutional, but it may not be," Carson said.

Federal Judge James B. MacMillan has suggested busing as a means of further desegregating Charlotte-Mecklenburg schools. The schools now are under court order to come up with a plan that will further desegregate, but are in the process of fighting that order in the courts.

Carson cited a Jaycee poll from Charlotte that showed 94.8 per cent of 1,033 persons answering to "favor neighborhood schools."

Black people and white people want neighborhood schools, Carson argued. He was the only one to speak on the bill.

"I don't know what the courts will do, but we can state that the policy of this state is against segregation.

"And it's against involuntary busing of students."

LAW FIRM PLANS TEST OF ANTIBUSING LAW

By NANCY DRACHEY

Observer Staff Writer

A Charlotte law firm said Wednesday it will seek a constitutionality test of the new antibusing law.

The antibusing law, sponsored by Mecklenburg Rep. James H. Carson, received final approval in the N.C. House Wednesday, the last day of the General Assembly session.

The new law prohibits busing for purposes of integration or segregation, requiring a school board to assign children to the school closest to their homes.

Adam Stein, a partner of civil rights lawyer Julius I. Chambers, said their firm would ask the U.S. District Court here to determine the new law's constitutionality.

Normally, the constitutionality of state laws is argued before a court of three federal judges.

Chambers and his firm have represented the Negro parents and teachers who brought the Charlotte-Mecklenburg school desegregation case before the federal court here.

The new law, titled "To Protect The Neighborhood School System," would virtually assure some all-Negro and all-white schools since neighborhoods are segregated.

School Board attorneys Brock Barkley and William J. Waggoner have said the law would have to be obeyed unless it was stricken down in federal court.

Barkley told board members he thought the law was unconstitutional and would be tossed out if tested in federal court.

The antibusing law was approved in the Senate on Tuesday after earlier approval in the House. The Senate tacked on a technical amendment which the House approved Wednesday.

CIVIL RIGHTS LAWYERS WILL TEST BUSING LAW

By KAY REIMLER

News Staff Writer

Charlotte civil rights attorneys plan to take the newly passed state law forbidding involuntary busing to court to try to have it declared unconstitutional.

The law, sponsored by Mecklenburg Rep. James H. Carson

Jr., prohibits busing of children to school to promote segregation or desegregation and requires the assignment of a child to the school nearest his home.

J. LeVonne Chambers, the attorney who brought the desegregation suit against the School Board, told The News today that his office will test the law in the court.

CHAMBERS said he has "no idea" when the case might come up.

The case, he said, will be heard before a panel of three federal judges, not necessarily from North Carolina, appointed by the chief judge of the U.S. Fourth Circuit Court.

That court is in recess until September, the attorney said, adding that he doesn't know if the three-judge panel could be appointed before September.

The law as it stands could have an effect on any desegregation plan the Charlotte-Mecklenburg School Board might devise.

School attorneys agree that the board must abide by the law until the measure is stricken down in court.

Chambers told The News that a number of similar state laws were struck down by the courts during the late 1950's and early 1960's because they obstructed the desegregation of schools.

If all school children in the Charlotte-Mecklenburg system attend the school closest to their homes, the system would retain a number of racially identifiable schools since many neighborhoods in the county are segregated.

ANTI-BUSING LAW TARGET OF MOTION

By VIVIAN MONTS

News Staff Writer

Civil rights attorneys here today asked the federal court to override a new state law prohibiting involuntary busing of children outside their school districts.

A motion filed this morning by Adam Stein, law partner of J. LeVonne Chambers requested an order by Judge James B. McMillan which would prohibit the Charlotte-Mecklenburg Board of Education from using the law.

The motion was filed in connection with a suit seeking total integration of local schools. The court ruled last spring that schools here must have more desegregation.

Judge McMillan has not yet ruled on the busing request, but has granted an attached request by the attorneys asking that the names of the N. C. State Board of Education and Dr. A. Craig Phillips, state superintendent of public instruction, be added to the list of defendants in the suit.

THE ORIGINAL defendant was the local school board. School Board members were added later as individual defendants in the suit.

The state law the civil rights attorneys are seeking to overturn provides that "involuntary busing of students . . . is prohibited, and public funds shall not be used for any such busing."

The attorneys claim the law, passed July 2, forbids the local school board from carrying out court orders to comply with the school desegregation requirements of the Constitution.

The papers filed this morning state that "this is so because compulsory (pupil) assignments and involuntary busing . . . are necessary devices" for complying with court orders for desegregation of local schools.

Judge McMillan has never required involuntary busing in the local school system but stated in an order April 23 that "there is no reason except emotion . . . why school buses cannot be used by the board to provide the flexibility and economy necessary to desegregate the schools."

The temporary order asked by Stein would be in effect pending a decision by a three-judge panel as to whether or not the state law is constitutional. The civil rights attorneys claim it is not.

The attorneys claim that if the local school board is not immediately stopped from using the state law, its members will fail to comply with Judge McMillan's orders for the desegregation of schools here.

The anti-busing law originated in Mecklenburg County. It was introduced first in the House of Representatives by Mecklenburg Republican Rep. James H. Carson Jr.

School administrators contacted by The News this morning disagreed somewhat with Lt. Stroud's statement on marijuana sales in the schools.

"I question buying on the junior high campus," said Steven D. Wallin, principal at Coulwood Junior High School. "I haven't seen any here or on any other junior high campus."

And Thelbert C. Wright, principal at West Mecklenburg High School, said that "If you can buy that stuff in the big schools, we certainly don't know anything about it."

North Mecklenburg's assistant principal, B. K. Hurd, reacted to Stroud's statement by saying that "he (Stroud) knows something we don't know. I wouldn't be surprised at their being able to get it, but to my knowledge as to it being on our school grounds and being sold, no."

The News was able to contact only a few high school administrators because of the vacation period.

'NO BUSING' LAW IS CHALLENGED IN COURT

By NANCY BRACHEY

Observer Staff Writer

Civil rights lawyers Tuesday challenged the constitutionality of the new N.C. law that prohibits involuntary busing of children for racial balance in the schools.

The law also prohibits assignment of school children outside their attendance district to achieve a racial balance.

Its purpose, motive and effect;" said the law firm of civil rights lawyer Julius L. Chambers, is to prevent school boards in the state from complying with federal court orders for desegregation in compliance with the U.S. Constitution.

The lawyers asked that the new law be sent to a three-judge federal court for a constitutionality test. Pending that decision, they asked U.S. District Judge James B. McMillan to grant an injunction preventing consideration, application, administration and enforcement of the new law.

Chambers' firm filed the complaint in connection with the Charlotte-Mecklenburg school desegregation case, which is before McMillan.

The civil rights lawyers contended that "involuntary busing and pupil assignment" prohibited by the law are "necessary devices" to carry out existing court orders here and elsewhere in N.C. and to comply with constitutional requirements.

They alleged that unless the court prevents it, the Charlotte-Mecklenburg School Board will use the law to sidestep McMillan's court orders of April 23 and June 2 for desegregation of local schools.

The board has until Aug. 4 to present its second try at a desegregation plan for schools and faculties. The first pupil desegregation plan was rejected by the judge June 20.

(McMillan has not told the school board it must transport

students. He has said that the school board may use any means to accomplish desegregation of Charlotte-Mecklenburg schools.)

A number of other school districts in N. C. are also under federal court orders to desegregate this fall and next.

Also Tuesday, the N. C. Board of Education and Dr. A. Craig Phillips, state superintendent of public instruction, were made defendants in the Charlotte-Mecklenbug school desegregation case.

This follows a ruling issued by U. S. District Judge Algernon Butler of Raleigh that education officials have a duty in school desegregation.

The State, however, has announced an objection to Butler's ruling, and says it will appeal any decision that makes the State responsible for school desegregation.

Butler's order said the State officers share with local units the burden to actively seek the desegregation of the public schools.

McMILLAN WILL IGNORE NEW ANTIBUSING LAW

By WARREN KING

Observer Staff Writer

A recently enacted N.C. "antibusing" law apparently has little effect on the Charlotte-Mecklenburg School Board's plan to desegregate local schools.

Federal Judge James B. McMillan said Tuesday that a temporary restraining order on the law, (which prohibits involuntary busing of school children), was not necessary in considering the school board's plan.

Civil rights lawyer Julius L. Chambers asked for the order during a three-hour U.S. District Court hearing Tuesday on the school board's new desegregation plan which included the busing of black students to predominately white schools.

The statute, passed this summer by the General Assembly, prohibits busing of a student against his will.

Mecklenburg School Supt. William Self testified he didn't believe the board was influenced by the law in drawing up the desegregation plan.

The plan turns primarily on the concept of voluntary busing and contains provisions for reassigning students who object to being bused.

Self said he felt the busing was proposed for the same reason seven black schools would be closed under the plan and their students bused to the white schools: "To afford better educational opportunities (for Negro students) and prevent overcrowding (schools that would not be closed under the plan)."

Mecklenburg Rep. James H. Carson Jr., author of the anti-busing law, said in an interview the board was "quite proper" in ignoring the statute. It was not intended to interfere with the board's desegregation efforts, he said.

The law itself contains numerous exceptions that would allow busing, including one nonspecific provision for pupils reassignment because of "other circumstances."

In explaining the school board's position in regard to the law, attorney Maurice Weinstein said during the hearing that the exceptions provided for in the statute "swallow" it.

Weinstein said the state attorney general's office had told him it would seek to further clarify the law in the near future and requested that no action be taken on it during Tuesday's hearing.